THE JOURNAL OF JEWISH STUDIES

CONTENTS

THE DAMASCUS FRAGMENTS AND THE ORIGIN OF THE JEWISH CHRISTIAN SECT

In the course of discussion of the historical background of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and particularly of the Habakkuk Scroll, scholars have persistently drawn their arguments from, or made reference to, the Genizah Damascus Fragments preserved in the Cambridge University Library, which were published by Schechter under the not very well chosen title of Fragments of a Zadokite Work. It may be opportune therefore to undertake now the task of determining the date of composition of this document (which will be referred to throughout as Fragments) by turning to account for this purpose some decisive, but hitherto overlooked, evidence. A few preliminary observations on the nature of the Fragments may serve as an introduction to the main task.

1. THE LITERARY FORM AND CONTENTS OF THE FRAGMENTS

It is well known that the text of the Fragments has come down to us in a very unsatisfactory condition. Apart from the gaps caused by physical injury to the leaves of the manuscript and the numerous mistakes which are almost certainly those of the copyist, the arguments seem to have been arranged without regard to any recognisable logical order or pattern. The manuscript, as justly described by Schechter, leaves " the impression that we are dealing with extracts from a larger work, put together, however, in a haphazard way, with little regard to completeness or order."[1] The text of the recently published Discipline Scroll is not much better. It is worth reading what Professor M. Burrows has said about it:

> The whole document, as a matter of fact, is so lacking in any logical order or connection of its parts as to suggest that it was composed in what may be called " scrapbook fashion." Separate and independent bodies of material seem to have been copied on the same scroll in the order in which they came into the copyist's hands, much as we suppose the books of the Old Testament prophets were put together.[2]

The fragmentary and disjointed state of the text of the Discipline Scroll may be equally well, or perhaps even better, explained by supposing that the copyist had before him " scraps " or remains of ancient texts which he had collected, later transcribing them into his scroll. In any case, does not all this suggest that the copyist of the scroll lived at a period when the process of disintegration of texts that had once been complete and well ordered was accomplished ? A long period of time must, therefore, have elapsed

---

[1] *Fragments of a Zadokite Work,* Cambridge, 1910; 10.
[2] *Oudtest. Studiën,* viii (1950); 162.

before these texts were reduced to fragments and transcribed in this state by the copyist. This would indicate that our Discipline Scroll was actually written down at a late stage in the history of the sect. The same considerations apply to the original scroll from which the copyists of the Fragments transcribed their text.

The contents of the Fragments fall easily into two groups: one legislative, consisting of precepts of law and rules of discipline, and another which, owing to its hortative character, may be described as homiletic comprising a collection of fragmentary homilies.[1] A feature of these homilies is the use of Biblical passages as symbols typifying historical occurrences, whether in the past or in the present, the meaning of which is disclosed through an appropriate interpretation (*pesher*) of God's revealed words. We have in the Habakkuk Scroll an example of this peculiar exegetical method as applied to a single prophetical book. In the Fragments it is applied to a *catena* of suitable Biblical passages ; and it is not surprising, therefore, to encounter the technical term *pesher* in the text of the homilies.[2] Single Biblical expressions are also treated as symbols in the Fragments, and this stylistic device, combined with the bad state of preservation of the text, makes the task of interpretation very difficult.

The *Leitmotif* of the homilies is, nevertheless, easily discernible: comprehension of the significance of the course of history leads to salvation. God in His wisdom has laid down for ever the pattern of events and each period of past history is but a replica of the same pattern, which will also be observed in the ultimate period of history, " in the last days." The outline of the pattern is very simple: sin against God and His law is followed by punishment and destruction of the nation except for a minority, " the remnant," whom God preserves for the sake of His covenant with the forefathers. When in the course of ages the people become conscious of their guilt and repent God sends to them the Saviour. The number and duration of such periods of history, which are moulded according to the pattern: sin—punishment of the wicked ; preservation of the " remnant "—repentance—salvation, are predetermined by God, who imparts the knowledge of them to His prophets. The Fragments apparently distinguish at least three such periods.

The first period may be divided for the convenience of exposition into two parts. The first comprises the history of mankind from the creation of the world to the Babylonian exile. It is a tale of sin, mainly " fornication," and punishment. Only the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were exempt from it ; they kept God's precepts and were called " God's friends " with whom He entered into an eternal covenant.[3] Jacob's sons sinned and were

---

[1] Observe the almost identical opening, *we'atah shim'u 'elay* on p. 1, line 1 ; p. 2, line 2 ; p. 2, line 14 (Hebrew Text, ed. SCHECHTER), which seems to mark the beginnings of originally separate homilies.
[2] P. 4, line 14.   [3] P. 2, line 16 to p. 3, line 4.

punished ; their children in Egypt sinned again by " walking in the stubbornness of their heart " and by " eating blood," and were punished in the desert. The same sin " of stubbornness of heart " was committed also by their descendants in Palestine who abandoned God's covenant. As a punishment the country was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar and they themselves—the heirs of the covenant with the patriarchs[1]—were delivered unto the sword except for a " remnant " whom God spared.[2] The Babylonian exile concluded the first part of this period. The second part began apparently with the Return and lasted several centuries. It concluded when God raised the " Moreh Ṣedeq " to teach the way of salvation, after the people had recognised their guilt, repented, and sought for God with a perfect heart.[3] Repentance brought about salvation.

The second period repeated in its essential features the pattern of the first : sin—punishment—preservation of a " remnant." In this period the sin was committed by the " Man of Scoffing " and his followers, who revolted against God's law and His Messiah. Adequate punishment was meted out to them :

> Thus Israel revolted when the Man of Scoffing arose, who preached false doctrines[4] to Israel and led them astray into the pathless wilderness—to " level ancient heights,"[5] to depart from the paths of justice and to " pull out the boundary [signs] set up by their forefathers in their possessions,"[6] for the purpose of fastening upon them the curses of God's covenant[7] and delivering them to the avenging sword . . . since they abolished the covenant and annulled the statute. . . . And God's wrath was kindled against their congregation because they turned[8] all their wealth[9] and deeds into " uncleanness " before Him.[10]

The congregation of the " Man of Scoffing " suffered their punishment during a catastrophe in which the " land " was destroyed, and which was provoked by their sins :

> At the time of the destruction of the land there arose those who removed the boundary [signs] and led Israel astray.[11] The land became desolate because they spoke rebellion against God's commandments [given] through Moses and also through His holy Messiah ; they prophesied lies in order to make Israel turn away from God. . . ."[12]
> And all the despisers [of God's commandments] . . . and all

---

1 P. 3, line 10: *ba'ey haberith harishonim.*
2 P. 3, line 4.   3 P. 1, lines 4-12.
4 Literally: " water of deceit." It is a metaphor for " false doctrine." Cpr. L. GINZBERG, *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte* in *MGWJ,* 1911; 671.
5 Another metaphor for " abolish ancient customs."
6 Again a metaphor for " abolish ancient institutions." For rabbinic parallels see GINZBERG, *op. cit.,* 672.
7 Cpr. *Deut.* xxix, 19-20.   8 Read *lehasimam for l h sh m.*
9 Read *honam* for *hamonam.*   10 P. 1, line 14 to p. 2, line 1.
11 Cpr. similar expressions in the preceding quotation.
12 P. 5, line 20 to p. 6, line 2.

the backsliders were delivered to the sword . . . when God brought the visitation upon the land in order to requite the wicked.[1]

A "remnant," however—the successors of whom are the author of the homilies in the Fragments and his followers—who held steadfastly [to God's commandments][2]—were spared and "escaped to the Land of the North "[3]—the land of Damascus. For

> . . . God remembered the covenant of the forefathers and raised up wise men from Aaron and sages from Israel and made to them an announcement,[4] and they dug the well.[5]—"The princes dug the well, the nobles of the people dug it by the direction of the lawgiver "[6]—"The well " is the law and "those who dug it " are the penitents from Israel, who came out from the land of Judah and dwelt in the land of Damascus, all of whom God called "princes.". . .[7]

This text contains the significant statement that a divine oracle had been instrumental in saving the refugees from the " avenging sword " at the time of the " destruction of the land." It also throws light on the meaning of the following passage of the Fragments which discloses that the " land " or " land of Judah " in the Fragments from which the refugees had escaped was really Jerusalem :

> "God showeth mercy unto them that love Him and hold steadfast to Him for a thousand generations "[8] [that is to say, a thousand generations] of the " House of Division "[9] who went out from the Holy City [Jerusalem], having faith in God at the period when Israel sinned and polluted the holy place.[10]

Still another passage of the Fragments may contain the information that the oracle was delivered by the Messiah. But the text of this passage is corrupt and its interpretation far from certain :

> Now hearken unto me, all ye who have entered into the covenant, and I will disclose to you the fate [lit. the ways] of the wicked. God, who loveth Understanding, Knowledge, and Intelligence, hath set before Him Wisdom and Understanding to minister unto Him. Patience and abundance of forgiveness is with Him to pardon those who repent of sin, and Power, Might, and Great Wrath of flaming fire, in which all the angels of destruction dwell, for the total annihilation of those who rebel and despise the statutes. For, from all eternity, God rejected them and

---

1 P. 7, line 9 . . . 14.   Nothing shows better than these quotations how wide of the mark are those scholars who place the date of the composition of the Fragments in the pre-Christian period. They must assume that the sect, with which the Fragments are connected, succumbed and had to leave the country, while their enemies, the followers of the " Man of Scoffing," remained victorious. The text of the Fragments asserts the exact opposite : the followers of the " Man of Scoffing " were destroyed.

2 P. 7, line 9.1. Add *bemiswoth 'el* as on p. 3, line 12.

3 P. 7, line 9 . . . 14.

4 *Wayashmi'em;* cpr. *Mishnah, Sheq.* I, 1.

5 Metaphor for " found salvation."   6 *Pesher* applied to *Num.* xxi, 18.

7 P. 6, lines 2-6.

8 *Ex.* xx, 6, combined with *Deut.* vii, 9.

9 *Mibeyth peleg,* a reference to the " fathers of the secession " with whom the count of a " thousands generations begins." Cpr. GINZBERG, *MGWJ,* 1912 ; 688/9.   10 P. 20, lines 22-23.

before [the foundations of the earth] were established[1] He knew about their deeds and abhorred them. . . .[2] And he hid His face from the land. . . .

But in the face of all these [the wicked],[3] He raised up for Himself men of distinction, for the purpose of leaving a " remnant " on earth and of covering the face of the world with their progeny. And He imparted information to them through His Messiah, His Holy Spirit that is Truth itself.[4]

The saving of the " remnant " on this occasion was, in the eyes of the author of the homilies, a replica of the much earlier event when, at the time of the destruction of the country by Nebuchadnezzar, the " remnant " of Israel had been saved in the persons of " the priests and the Levites and the sons of Sadok," mentioned by Ezekiel. Hence the text of the prophet can be applied in a *pesher* to the later event :[5]

" The priests " are the penitents of Israel who went out from the land of Judah [" and the Levites "][6] are those who accompanied them. " And the sons of Sadoq " are the elect of Israel and men of distinction who will survive " in the last days."[7]

The third and last period, according to the historiographical conception of the author of the homilies, is actually the period in which the homilies are delivered, after the refugees from Jerusalem entered into the New Covenant, *haberith hahadashah,* in the land of Damascus. It is a period of transition, during which " Belial is let loose in Israel," inspiring the lawless activities of the followers of the " Man of Scoffing and Preacher of Lies."[8] It will end with the appearance of the " Messiah from Aaron and Israel," when all those who have despised God's statutes will be destroyed by Belial, just as the community of the " Man of Scoffing " were delivered to the sword during the destruction of Jerusalem. Only members of the Covenant of the land of Damascus, who have kept God's commandments as their forebears did, will be saved. But members who have abandoned the Covenant will share the fate of the followers of the " Man of Scoffing " :

. . . Those who keep them[9] [the commandments and statutes]

---

1 Read *nosdu* and add *mosdey 'eres.* The phraseology of this passage is related to chapter viii of *Proverbs*

2 The text is here corrupt.

3 *Ubhkhullam* refers to the " wicked," the main subject of this homily. GINZBERG, *MGWJ,* 1911; 676, connects it with the preceding *sheney 'olam*; but this involves him in emending the text and in interpreting " Messiahs " as meaning " prophets " as well as " the patriarchs."

4 P. 2, lines 2-13. For the last expression compare *John* xv, 26 : " The Spirit of Truth that proceedeth from the Father " ; also xvi, 13. See GINZBERG, *op. cit.,* 677.

5 The passage from Ezekiel quoted in the Fragments differs slightly from the massoretic text.

6 These words must be added, as many scholars have suggested, to the text of the Fragments.

7 P. 4, lines 2-4. It is quite clear from the context that the expression " Sons of Sadoq " is used as mere metaphor and warrants no connection between the Sadducees and the Fragments.

8 P. 4, line 13 to p. 5, line 19. 9 Read *'otham* for *'otho.*

are " the poor of the flock."[1] They shall be saved at the period of " visitation " and the others shall be delivered to the sword, when the " Messiah from Aaron and Israel " comes. Just as it happened during the period of the first visitation [the destruction of Jerusalem] that, as in Ezekiel [ix, 4] a mark was set upon the foreheads of those who sighed and cried [in order to save them] and the others were delivered to the sword, to avenge the covenant, so this shall be the judgment also on all those who have entered into His covenant but have not kept the statutes: they shall be consigned to destruction by Belial on the day of God's visitation . . . for they have entered into the Covenant of Repentance but have not turned away from the path of traitors.[2]

Fortified by his apocalyptic vision the author of the homilies exhorts his listeners (or readers) to adopt suitable rules of behaviour in preparation for the " last days ": they must separate themselves entirely from the followers of the " Man of Scoffing," the despisers of God's statutes:

And while this period [that is to say, the present period—from the point of the author] runs towards its completion . . .[3] there shall be no more association with the House of Judah, but every man shall keep his station. The wall [of separation] is built! The boundary is set up![4]

[The followers of the " Preacher of Lies "] have opened their mouths to blaspheme against the statutes of the divine covenant, saying that these are not right, and they utter abomination against them. . . . Those who come close to them shall not be exonerated.[5]

2.   THE CLUE TO THE DATE

The preceding synopsis of the three periods into which the author of the homilies divides the history of mankind reveals that the description of the second period is the most relevant for the purpose of determining the date of composition of the Fragments. For the central event in this period is the destruction of the " land," that is, of Jerusalem, in the course of which the community of the " Man of Scoffing " perished by the sword, and only the " remnant " that had been faithful to God's commandments escaped unscathed to the " land of Damascus." The precise reference to such an important historical event as the destruction of Jerusalem makes the task of dating the events described in the second period straightforward and simple. Only a few possibilities need to be considered —in actual fact, only one ; but, strangely enough, this possibility, as far as I know, has never been adopted for the purpose of dating the Fragments.

---

1 Zech. xi, 11.
2 P. 19, lines 9-17; cpr. also p. 4, lines 6-10; p. 7, line 21 to p. 8, line 2; and p. 20, lines 10-13, where the " traitors " are referred to as those who have joined the " men of scoffing " and " despised . . . the pledge of faith which they affirmed in the land of Damascus—the New Covenant."
3 Unfortunately the Fragments do not disclose the length of this period.
4 P. 4, lines 10-13.   Read huḥaq for raḥaq.
5 P. 5, lines 11-15.

Lagrange, who justly recognised that the " great catastrophe "
of the destruction offers the securest basis for dating the Fragments,
lists four possible events to which this " catastrophe " could be
related : (a) " the sacriligeous contamination of the Temple " by
Antioch ; or (b) by Pompey ; (c) the destruction of Jerusalem by
Titus ; or (d) by the Romans, at the time of Hadrian.[1] Having
previously reached the conclusion that the Fragments were com-
posed sixty years after the " catastrophe," he eliminates the first
two possibilities, arguing that sixty years after Antioch's persecu-
tion, or after the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey, each of these
events had become an insignificant episode in the life of the nation.[2]
He makes further two assumptions : (a) that the exodus of the
sect from Jerusalem took place under the leadership of the " Moreh
Ṣedeq,"[3] and (b) that the " Man of Lies " was also *the* military
leader of the nation in war.[4] The second of these assumptions
helps him to eliminate the third possibility, that the catastrophe in
the Fragments is related to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 c.e. For, he
says, the leaders of the revolt at the time of Titus were at least two,
John and Simon both " doués d'un égal prestige." There remains,
thus, only the fourth possibility : the " catastrophe " in the Frag-
ments is to be identified with the destruction of the country during
the Jewish revolt at the time of Hadrian. This revolt had only one
military leader, Bar Kochba, who " a joui d'un prestige unique,"[5]
and whom Lagrange does not hesitate to identify with the " Man of
Lies."

Is it necessary to state that the two assumptions, from which
Lagrange deduced his startling results, are both false ? There is not
the slightest shred of evidence in the Fragments that the exodus of
the sect from Jerusalem (if it was then already a sect !) was led by
the " Moreh Ṣedeq," and no hint whatever that the " Man of
Lies " was a military leader. The only passage of the Fragments
which Lagrange is able to quote[6] in support of his contention about
the martial prowess of the " Man of Lies " reads as follows :

> . . . And from the day of the ascension of the Unique Teacher
> " until the men of war were destroyed " (*'ad tom kol 'anshey
> hammilhamah*), who had joined the " Man of Lies "—about forty
> years elapsed.[7]

The Hebrew phrase which I have transliterated is a direct
quotation, with the omission of one word, from Deut. ii, 4. Can it
be admitted that this Biblical phrase alone, contained in a work con-
sisting almost entirely of Biblical phrases used as metaphors and
symbols, should be interpreted literally as " armed force," and—
without any other evidence in support—such conclusion as the
identification of the " Man of Lies," with Bar Kochba derived

1 *Revue Biblique*, 1912; 328.
2 *Ibid.*
3 *Op. cit.*, 324.
4 *Op. cit.*, 227; n. 7.
5 *Op. cit.*, 329.
6 *Ibid.*
7 P. 20, lines 13-15.

B

from it ?   Surely this phrase in the Fragments is, like the original phrase in the Bible, a metaphor for " disloyal and contentious " people.

There is, however, a valid reason for eliminating both the period of Antioch's invasion (which some scholars have adopted) and of Pompey's occupation of Jerusalem, as well as the period of the Bar Kochba revolt under Hadrian, from the list of the four possible dates with which the catastrophic event referred to in the Fragments might be related. The description of this event as " the destruction of the land " (Jerusalem), in which most of the inhabitants perished by the sword, does not apply to either of them. Jerusalem was not destroyed, nor were her citizens massacred, at the time of Antioch, nor at the time of Pompey, who occupied the city (not the Temple) peacefully. Concerning the Bar Kochba revolt, it is very doubtful whether Jerusalem was affected at all by the war; it is not likely that it was then destroyed again—there was little left after 70 C.E. to destroy, and it is certain that her citizens were not massacred. The (suspect) sources that tell us about a siege of Jerusalem relate also that the population left, or was expelled from, the city.   Thus, in conclusion, no event fits so exactly the description of the " catastrophe " in the Fragment as the fall and destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. This date must, therefore, be adopted for the central event in the second period of the historiographical scheme described in the Fragment.

3. THE CHURCH IN JERUSALEM

Let us now combine the date, 70 C.E., with the results achieved in my previous study concerning the Jewish-Christian origin of the Scrolls and the Fragments and the identification of " Moreh Ṣedeq " and the " Man of Lies " with Jesus and Paul,[1] and let us apply these data to the interpretation of the periods of history described in the Fragments by considering the latter as a Christian document.

It will emerge now that the first period concludes with the ministry of Jesus (" Moreh Ṣedeq "), which was ushered in by twenty years of repentance and " seeking " for God—an unmistakable reference to the effects of John the Baptist's preaching.[2]

The second period was inaugurated by the activity of Paul— which in the eyes of his opponents was a rebellion against God and Jesus—and it ends with the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E., in the course of which Paul's followers perished.   The passage in the Fragments :

. . . And from the day of the ascension of the Unique Teacher " until all the men of war were destroyed " who had joined the " Man of Lies "—about forty years elapsed,[3]

is thus literally exact, since about forty years elapsed between Jesus'

---

1 *JJS*, *II* (1951).

2 This was seen clearly by MARGOLIOUTH, but his attempt to read into the text a direct reference to the person of John himself cannot be considered successful.   3 P. 20, lines 13-15.

death and the destruction of Jerusalem. Before the fall of Jerusalem the leaders—" wise men from Aaron and sages from Israel "—received an oracle from God conveying warning of the imminent catastrophe. Thereupon they left the city and took refuge in the " land of the North." What does all this mean ?

In order to appreciate fully the import of events in the second period as described in the Fragments it is necessary to remember that, although the origin of the Fragments themselves is Jewish-Christian, the Jewish-Christian sect as such did not exist as a distinct body before the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. All Christians in Jerusalem and in Judaea were united until 70 C.E. in the Mother Church in Jerusalem and their unity was preserved despite great internal stresses and tensions. The Church in Jerusalem led by James, the brother of Jesus, was then Hebrew-Christian, adhering strictly to the Mosaic law. Consequently the description of the second period in the historiographical scheme of the Fragments, dealing with the situation in Jerusalem, applies, in fact, to the Church of Jerusalem as such.

Now this sketch of the history of the Church in Jerusalem, as contained in the Fragments, agrees almost entirely with all the information about this Church available in patristic sources. These may be quoted in full:

A. [Eusebius]: After the ascension of our Saviour, the Jews, in addition to their crime against him, had devised innumerable plots also against his apostles . . . Stephen . . . James, son of Zebedee . . . James [Jesus's brother]. . . . As for the other apostles, countless plots were laid against their lives, and they were banished from the land of Judaea. . . . Moreover, the people of the Church of Jerusalem, in accordance with a certain oracle that was vouchsafed by way of revelation to approved (*dokimois*) men there, had been commanded to depart from the city before the war, and to inhabit a certain city of Peraea [Transjordan]. They call it Pella. And when those who believed in Christ had removed from Jerusalem, as if holy men had utterly deserted both the royal metropolis of the Jews itself and the whole land of Judaea, the justice of God then visited upon them all their acts of violence against the Christ and the apostles by destroying that generation of wicked persons root and branch.[1]

B. [Epiphanius]: . . . When the city [Jerusalem] was about to be conquered by the Romans all the disciples were warned by an angel to remove from the city which was shortly to be destroyed. They became refugees and settled in Pella, a town in Transjordan belonging to the Decapolis.[2]

C. [Epiphanius on the Nazarenes]: The sect of Nazarenes dwells in Beroea in Coele-Syria, and in the Decapolis near Pella as well as in Basanitis in a district called Kokaba—in Hebrew, *Chochaba*. The sect had its beginnings here when all the disciples

1 *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 5, 1-3 ; SCHWARZ, 195.
2 *De Mens. et Pond.*, xv, 2-5 ; *MPG*, xliii, 261.

[or, apostles] settled in Pella after the removal from Jerusalem in consequence of Christ's injunction to leave the city and to emigrate in view of the impending siege.[1]

    D. [Epiphanius on the Ebionites]: This sect was started after the destruction of Jerusalem. When all those who believed in Christ settled in Peraea [Transjordan], mainly in the town of the Decapolis called Pella . . . close to Batanaea and Basanitis . . . Ebion got his opportunity. His first dwelling place was Kokaba, a village near Karnaim and Astarot in Basanitis. . . .[2]

It can easily be seen that there is a perfect congruence of at least two significant points in the account of the Fragments and the patristic sources: the warning conveyed by divine revelation to Christians in Jerusalem of the imminent destruction of the city and the consequent emigration to the " land of the North." Pella, which is explicitly mentioned in the patristic sources as the place of refuge—it is a characteristic feature of the Fragments and of the Scrolls to refrain from mentioning actual names of persons or places —is in fact situated almost to the north of Jerusalem. This congruence of external sources and the contents of the Fragments in describing historical events constitutes, I submit, irrefutable evidence of the Christian origin of the Fragments and the kindred Scrolls. There are, however, some discrepancies between the account in the Fragments and the patristic sources, which must not be overlooked.

    The first discrepancy is as follows: according to the Church Fathers the Catholic Christians were the recipients of God's warning, but, according to the Fragments, the Jewish-Christians were the beneficiaries of God's revelation. This discrepancy is, however, formal rather than substanial: for there was only one Church in Jerusalem, and those of its members who escaped to Pella were as yet not differentiated into Catholic and Jewish Christians. Both the Christian Fathers and the author of the Jewish Christian Fragments write about the escape from Jerusalem in the perspective of later events, after the secession of the Jewish-Christians from the Mother Church, and both can claim, therefore, with equal justice and equal disregard of history, that their respective forebears escaped from Jerusalem before the fall of the city. Thus the discrepancy between the sources affects not the truth of the historical events themselves but the manner of their presentation.

    Another Jewish-Christian source, the Recognitions of Clement, also claims, in statements made in the form of a " vaticinium ex eventu," that only the followers of the True Prophet (Jesus) were saved at the destruction of Jerusalem:

    Subsequently an additional clear proof of this great mystery is supplied [in the fact] that every believer in this Prophet foretold by Moses, who is baptised in His name, shall be kept unhurt from the destruction of war which hangs over the unbelieving nation, and the place itself ; while those who do not believe shall

be made exiles from their places and kingdom, so that even against their will they may understand and obey the will of God.[1]

In the Syriac version of the Recognitions these statements are amplified and slightly modified to give the sense that it was God's wisdom that had led the believers in the True Prophet to safety during the war in which the unbelievers who were guilty of secession perished.[2] We have thus, in an independent Jewish-Christian source, an exact parallel to the account given in the Fragments and an additional confirmation of the Jewish-Christian origin of the latter.

The second discrepancy between the patristic and the Jewish-Christian sources is a real one. The latter assert that the Pauline element of the Jerusalem Church perished in the Roman war and only the Hebrew Christians were saved, while, according to the former, *all* Christians had left Jerusalem before the fall of the city. Eusebius even maintains that not only Jerusalem but the whole of Judaea had been emptied of Christians, all of whom escaped destruction. In these circumstances, a critical examination of the individual sources becomes indispensable. Let me begin with the Church Fathers.

It is clear at a first glance that Eusebius' account cannot be accepted at its face value. His description of the events is a drawing of contrasts in black and white in order to emphasise in a dramatic manner the working of God's retributive justice—all Christians were saints and were therefore saved ; all Jews were guilty of crimes and were therefore punished :

> . . . And when those who believed in Christ had removed from Jerusalem, as if holy men had utterly deserted both the royal metropolis of the Jews and the whole land of Judaea, the justice of God then visited upon them all their acts of violence against the Christ and the apostles, by destroying that generation of wicked persons root and branch. . . .[3]

But, in fact, that " generation of wicked " Jews was not destroyed " root and branch." Jewish life continued in Palestine after the fall of Jerusalem and Jochanan b. Zakkai escaped from the besieged city and rebuilt the Talmudic academy in Jabneh—a striking parallel to the exodus of the leaders of the Church from the city. Again, a total evacuation of Christians from Palestine to Pella shortly before the fall of Jerusalem is very unlikely indeed. It would have been neither necessary nor practicable. According to Acts xxi, 20, there were " many myriads " of Christians in Palestine, and Pella could have hardly contained them all ; and in any case, Galilee, where the greatest number of Christians lived,

---

1 *Recognitions of Clement*, I, 39. E.T. (slightly modified) in Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Edinburgh, 1867 ; III, 169. SCHOEPS, *Theologie u. Gesch. d. Judenchristentums*, 47, first drew attention to this passage.
2 LAGARDE'S edition 23, 21-34. Cpr. SCHOEPS, *loc. cit.*
3 See quotation A in the body of the article.

was occupied by the Roman forces a few years before the fall of Jerusalem and these Christians were not in imminent danger.[1]

In short, Eusebius' account is tendencious and exaggerated, as concerns both the Christians and the Jews, and cannot be relied upon. It is possible, however, that the real situation is reflected in Eusebius' other passage stating that " a certain oracle . . . was vouchsafed by way of revelation to approved men there." From this reference we may conclude that at least the leaders of the Church in Jerusalem received the divine warning and escaped destruction.

An analysis of Epiphanius' statements gives similar results. His references to " all the disciples [who] were warned by an angel "[2]; " all the disciples [who] settled in Pella "[3]; and to " all those [who] believed in Christ [who] settled in Peraea,"[4] reveal, through their similarity in language to Eusebius (particularly in the last reference), the latter's influence or a derivation from a common source. Epiphanius is thus equally tendencious and his account must be rejected on the same ground as that of Eusebius. It is possible, however, that the expression " all the disciples " in his account should be taken *sensu strictu* as referring to the " leaders of the Church," particularly as the Venetian MS. has the reading " apostles " instead of " disciples " in the passage : " all the disciples [who] settled in Pella."[3] In brief, the information supplied by Epiphanius coincides with that given by Eusebius that at least the leaders of the Church escaped from Jerusalem ; but neither source can be trusted in regard to the information that all Christians had left the city before its fall. The conditions prevailing in Jerusalem before the fall of the city—on which the legend about Jochanan b. Zakkai being smuggled out in a coffin throws some light—would suggest too that the escape of a large body of citizens was unlikely. The account given in the Fragments, that the Hebrew Christian leaders left the city, appears therefore to be substantially correct.

The most interesting and, at first sight, disconcerting item of information contained in the Fragments concerns the presence in the Church of Jerusalem of an influential body of followers of Paul (" Man of Scoffing ") at the time of the Great Roman war. This is contrary to the assumption of modern scholars, who are inclined to deny that the Pauline point of view was represented at that period in Palestine.[5] I should like, however, to draw attention to Paul's statements in Gal. ii, 9-10, the implications of which fully confirm the assertion in the Fragments :

> [9] And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship ; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision. [10] Only they

---

[1] Cpr. also SCHOEPS, *op. cit.*, 266.   [2] See quotation B.
[3] See quotation C.   [4] See quotation D.
Aus Frühchrist. Zeit, Tübingen, 1945 ; 145.

would that we should remember the poor ; the same which I also was forward to do.

These passages represent the gist of the first Concordat reached between Paul and the leaders of the Hebrew Christians. W. L. Knox's comment on this matter is very pertinent. He writes :

> The language of Gal. ii, 10, is not of course to be interpreted merely as a vague and pious recommendation that the Gentile Christians should remember the fact that it is a Christian's duty to be charitable to his brethren. . . . The word *monon* [only] here, as in v, 13, I Cor. vii, 39, and II Thess. ii, 7, introduces a saving clause inserted as a necessary qualification of complete freedom with which the older Apostles recognise S. Paul's claims as regards the Gentiles. The point is of the utmost importance, since it shows that in this first agreement the claim of the Christians in Jerusalem to the alms of the Gentile converts was specifically recognised. The *ptochoi* [poor] are of course the Hebrew Christians, not the poor in general.[1]

The expression " alms " in Knox's excellent statement is perhaps not appropriate. It seems to me rather that in the first agreement the claim of the Church of Jerusalem that was recognised was not so much to the " alms " of the Gentile converts as to their regular contributions, analogous to those of the Jewish Diaspora for the benefit of the Temple in Jerusalem.

There is, however, yet another aspect to this matter of the collections from Gentile converts. It is certainly a concession on the part of Paul to recognise the claim of Hebrew Christians to the contributions of Gentile Christians, but, from another point of view, it may also be considered a concession of principle on the part of the leaders of the Hebrew Christians who, by accepting these collections, recognised, in this particular point at least, Paul's claim to an equal status for Hebrew and Gentile converts to Christianity. In order to appreciate the importance of this concession, an investigation into the whole Hebrew Christian attitude towards the Gentile converts to discover its underlying motive would be necessary. Here I must content myself with putting forward a few considerations or rather suggestions. There is, to begin with, very good evidence that, according to the rabbinic conception, idolatry was " defilement "[2] ; that, indeed, as has been very ably argued by G. Allon, idolatry was the reason why Gentiles who professed it were regarded as " defiled " (*tame'*).[3] From the discussion of the admission of Gentile converts into the Church in Acts xv, 5-9, it would appear that the Hebrew Christians shared the rabbis' conception :

> But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses. . . . And when there had

1 *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, Cambridge, 1925 ; 190, n. 20.
2 See BÜCHLER, *Studies in Sin and Atonement*, London, 1928 ; 293 ff.
3 *Tarbiz*, viii, 136-161.

been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them: " Men and brethren, ye know that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us ; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith.

From Peter's plea that faith " purified " the hearts of the Gentiles we may perhaps deduce that the Hebrew Christians considered circumcision and the law of Moses the indispensable means of " purification " of Gentiles,[1] who must, then, have been reputed by them to be " defiled " by idolatry.

It would be wrong, however, to assume that the expression " defilement " as referred to idolatrous Gentiles signified for the rabbis " ritual defilement " ; in fact, it meant chiefly " moral defilement," since idolatry was considered to be the hotbed of all sins and vices. The whole attitude of the rabbis towards the Gentiles seems to have been determined by their abhorrence of the immoral practices of the idolators.[2] Among the various rabbinic prohibitions concerning the idolatrous Gentiles, two appear to be relevant to our purpose. The Mishna forbids the acceptance of the shekel-tax from idolators[3] ; and, according to a Talmudic statement, a Jew should not enter into partnership with an idolator lest he be obliged to swear by a heathen god.[4]

The Jewish-Christian attitude towards the idolatrous Gentile is even more stringent. The Fragments enjoin: " No man, except on the advice of the ' council of Israel,' shall acquire anything belonging to the Gentiles, lest they blaspheme."[5] In the Discipline Scroll, this is extended to include all those who transgress God's commandments :

> For all are defiled who transgress God's words ; and none shall join with them in work or property, lest he be carried away by the sin of idolatry ('awon 'ashmah),[6] but shall keep far away from them in all things. . . . None shall eat or drink anything belonging to them nor take from them the smallest thing except for a price. . . . All their deeds are uncleanness (niddah) before Him and defilement (tame') is in all their property (hon).[7]

---

1 See also *Acts*, xv, 1. Compare *Gen. R.*, xliv, where it is stated that God's commandments were intended to " refine " Israel.

2 A readily accessible survey of the relevant sources may be found in STRACK-BILLERBECK, *Komm.* iv, Exkurs 15. Compare also TERTULIAN, *De Idolatria*, I.

3 *Mishnah, Sheq.* I, 5.

4 *B. Sanh.* 63b.

5 P. 12, lines 6-7. I have translated the verb *yissa'* with acquire, as in the phrase *naso' wenathon*, to acquire and to sell. I should like also to suggest that the expression " lest they blaspheme " refers to the possibility of the Gentile seller uttering an oath in the course of bargaining. We find something similar in the Talmudic statement referred to in the previous note.

6 From *Lev.*, xxii, 16. The literal translation would be: " iniquity requiring a trespass-offering," but, I suggest *'ashmah* is here, as in *Amos*, viii, 14, a metaphor for idolatry.

7 Plate iv, lines 14-15; 16-17; 19-20. Compare for the last sentence Fragments p. 2, line 1, and note 14 above.

Thus the Jewish-Christians considered the property of the " transgressors of God's word "—whether Gentiles or Gentile Christians—" uncleanness " and " defilement " ; and their forebears in the Jerusalem Church, the radical wing of the Hebrew Christians, the *ptochoi, 'Ebhyonim,* must have regarded the collections flowing from the Gentile churches to Jerusalem in a similar light, as a " defilement " of the Holy City and their acceptance by the Church as a sinful concession to Paul. We have evidence of this in the following diatribe against Paul, the " Wicked Priest," contained in the Habakkuk Scroll, which was composed in Jerusalem before the fall of the city :

> The Wicked Priest . . . abandoned God and betrayed the statutes for the sake of wealth (*hon*) ; he robbed[1] and amassed wealth from iniquitous men who rebelled against God ; he took the wealth of Gentiles and heaped up on himself the sin of idolatry (*'awon 'ashmah*) and he committed abominable deeds in all kinds of unclean defilement (*niddath tum'ah*).[2]

The identity of significant expressions in this passage of the Habakkuk Scroll with those used in the Discipline Scroll clearly shows that Paul is accused of having committed the sin of collecting moneys from the Gentiles, and of having abandoned the Mosaic laws.

The refusal by the *'Ebhyonim* of the Gentile collections had, however, a deeper root than their reluctance to employ " defiled " money for sacred purposes, just as the Temple in Jerusalem refused the sheqel-collections of the Gentiles. The collections made the Church of Jerusalem wealthy and undermined the ideal of " evangelical poverty." The passionate denunciation by the author of the Habakkuk Scroll of the " amassing of wealth " in the Church of Jerusalem clearly indicates his attitude. Mammon is for him unrighteous by definition, and riches corrupted ; and the same attitude is tersely expressed in the Ebionite Clementine Homilies xv, 9 : " To all of us possessions are sins."

This virulent protest of the *'Ebhyonim* in the Habakkuk Scroll indicates that in their eyes the Church of Jerusalem had, through its acceptance of the Gentile collections, surrendered to Paul's doctrines. The assertion of the Fragments that, before the fall of Jerusalem, the Pauline element dominated the Mother Church is therefore, from this particular point of view, correct. It must be added that it would appear from the Acts that the Apostle Peter was, to say the least, very sympathetic to Paul's point of view. We lack any information about the inner conflicts in the Jerusalem Church before and during the Roman War, but the *'Ebhyonim* opposition seems to have crystallised, under the impact of the

---

1 This is of course not meant to be literal. But, from the Hebrew Christian point of view, Paul collected moneys from the Gentile converts under false pretences, since they could not be saved without accepting the Mosaic laws. In this sense Paul's action was " robbery."

2 Col. VIII, lines 10-13 ; cpr. also X, lines 10-13.

B*

circumstances of their escape from destruction before the fall of Jerusalem, in the decision of secession from the Church and gave rise to the Jewish-Christian sect.

4.   The Origin of the Jewish-Christian Sect

The information hitherto available about the date of the secession of the Hebrew Christians from the Mother Church to form the separate sect of Jewish-Christians, as well as about the circumstances in which this secession took place, has been very scanty. The Fragments now add some new and significant items which enable us to form a more precise picture of the events—a picture conforming in a very large measure with the patristic sources but less so with the view of modern scholars.

According to Epiphanius, the localities inhabited by the Jewish-Christian sect[1] were Pella of the Decapolis, Beroea (=Aleppo) in Coele-Syria, Cochaba in Basinitis (*Bashan*), as well as some places in Arabia and Batanaea.[2]   The exact situation of Cochaba is not known ; [Eusebius places it south-west from Damascus],[3] and doubts have been expressed whether the Jewish-Christians were really settled in Aleppo.[4] But it appears that the Jewish-Christian sect was settled in a narrow strip of territory on the frontier between Syria and Arabia, stretching out in a southerly direction from Damascus to the southern shores of the Dead Sea.[5]   The name " land of Damascus," meaning " land of Syria," in the Fragments is a deliberately vague but not entirely inaccurate description of this territory, and it should be noted also that even a late source assigns Pella to Coele-Syria.[6]

The expression the " land of Damascus " is used in the Fragments in the phrase " those who entered into the New Covenant in the ' land of Damascus,' "[7] and in the phrase " the covenant and the pledge of faith which they had affirmed in the land of Damascus —the New Covenant."[8]   From these phrases we can deduce that " the New Covenant " was entered into not in Jerusalem but in Syria, after the escape to Pella.   This Covenant is also referred to as " the Covenant of Repentance "[9] and its members are described as " the penitents of Israel,"[10] expressions which throw some light on the inner motives which led the Jerusalem Hebrew Christians to secede from the Church and to form a separate sect.   Why " repentance " and " penitents " ?   What was the sin committed by the

---

[1] The names of " Nazarenes " and " Ebionites " in Epiphanius should be treated as variants referring to the same Jewish sect.   See Schoeps, *Theol. u. Gesch.*, 10 ; 19.

[2] *Panarion*, xxix, 7 ; Holl 330, xxx, 2 ; Holl 335.

[3] *Onomastikon*, ed. Klostermann, 172.   For other attempts at identification see Schoeps, *op. cit.*, 273/4.

[4] See the discussion in Schoeps, *op. cit.*, 19. It should be observed, however, that the sceptics appear to trust Jerome's statements too much.

[5] Cpr. Schoeps, *op. cit.*, 274.

[6] Stephanos Byzantios in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, Pella.

[7] P. 6, line 19.   [8] P. 20, line 12.

[9] P. 19, line 16.   [10] P. 4, line 2 ; 6, line 5 ; 8, line 16.

Hebrew Christians in Jerusalem ? It could hardly be, I suggest, the sin of abandoning the Mosaic laws, since the Hebrew Christians adhered strictly to these laws and, indeed, appear in the Fragments as the loyal " remnant," who had steadfastly upheld them. We must assume therefore that their sin consisted in having lived in association with the followers of Paul in Jerusalem and in having connived at and profited from the Gentile collections. This assumption is based on the consideration that the members of the sect who had entered into the Covenant of Damascus were required, as it appears both from the Fragments and the Discipline Scroll, to sever all relations with the Catholic Christians, who were to be treated in this like Gentiles. It is enjoined in the Fragments: " There shall be no more association with the House of Judah "[1] —the latter expression almost certainly referring to Catholic Christians.[2] The " Covenant of Damascus " should therefore be regarded as the charter of separation of the Jewish-Christian sect, agreed upon by the Hebrew Christians from Jerusalem, both as a token of repentance of the sin of associating with the " transgressors of God's law " and as a promise of salvation " in the last days," when those who still persisted in these transgressions would be punished.

Owing to the lack of adequate sources, the task of reconstructing the single steps which led to this momentous decision of the Hebrew Christian refugees in the " land of Damascus " is very hazardous, but some attempt may be made here. As long as James, the brother of Jesus, lived, the Hebrew Christians submitted to the Concordat with Paul which assured the flow of the collections from Gentile churches to Jerusalem. After James's death in 67 c.e.,[3] the opposition among the Hebrew Christians raised its head again, and we possess now in the Habakkuk Scroll a kind of " manifesto," in which Paul is violently denounced for rebellion against God's laws and for collecting Gentile moneys. The date of composition of the Habakkuk Scroll appears to be indicated in the following passage, which was apparently written when the danger of the conquest of Jerusalem by the Romans became imminent:

> The explanation [of Habakkuk ii, 8] refers to the present
> Jerusalem priests [apostles][4] who amass wealth (*hon*) and gain

---

1 P. 4, line 11.

2 Cpr. HEGESIPPUS in EUSEBIUS, *Hist. Eccl.*, iv, 22, 4: " Now these were the different opinions in the circumcision among the sons of the Israelites against the tribe of Judah and the Christ: Essenes, Gallilæans, etc."

3 Scholars are divided in their views about the date of James's martyrdom. Some follow Josephus in placing the event in 62/3, others Hegesippus, according to whom, the Roman war started soon after James's execution. I have adopted Hegesippus' date, since Josephus' account is open to a very serious suspicion of being an interpolation.

4 The expression *kohen* in the Habakkuk Scroll means, I submit, " apostle " in the wide connotation of this term as it has been established by v. CAMPEN-HAUSEN, *Der urchristliche Apostelbegriff*, in *Studia Theologica* I (1948); 96-130. Paul describes in *Rom.* xv. 16, his mission as apostle in sacerdotal term, *leitourgon . . . hierourgounta*. The word *kahen* in *II Chr.* xi, 15, is translated in the LXX with *leitourgein*. Compare also *Heb.*, iii, 1.

from the spoils of Gentiles, but in the end their wealth and spoils will be given to the Roman (*Kittī'īm*) soldiers.[1]

The Hebrew Christian opposition met, however, with no success. On the contrary, as it would appear from the following passages of the Fragments, Paul's followers imposed their doctrines on the Church in Jerusalem:

> At the time of the destruction of the land [that is, during the Roman war] there arose those who removed the boundary [signs] and led Israel astray. The land became desolate because they spoke rebellion against God's commandments [given] through Moses and also through His holy Messiah; they prophesied lies in order to make Israel turn away from God. . . .[2]

Then came the divine warning to the leaders of the Hebrew Christians who escaped to Pella. What happened in Pella is told by Eusebius, following Hegesippus:

> After the martyrdom of James and the taking of Jerusalem which followed immediately, it is recorded that those apostles and disciples of the Lord who still survived, met together from all quarters and, together with our Lord's relatives after the flesh . . . they all with one consent approved Symeon the son of Clopas.[3]

The election of Symeon was apparently far from unanimous, for in other passages of Eusebius, who again follows Hegesippus, we read:

> . . . the son of Jesus' uncle, Symeon the son of Clopas, was appointed bishop; whom all put forward, being a cousin of the Lord, as the second [bishop]. . . . For this reason they used to call the church a virgin; for she had not yet been corrupted by vain teachings. But Thebuthis, because he was not made bishop, began secretly to corrupt her from the seven sects among the [Jewish] people to which he himself belonged; from which came Simon (whence the Simonians) and Cleobius (whence the Cleobians) and Dositheus (whence the Dositheans) and Gorthaeus (whence the Goratheni) and the Masbotheans. . . . From these sprang false Christians, false prophets, false apostles, those who have divided the unity of the church by injurious words against God and against his Christ.[4]

This text is very difficult, but I think that we may gather from

---

[1] Col. ix, lines 4-6. I have translated the phrase *ul'aḥarith hayyamim* as " in the end " without any eschatological meaning.

[2] P. 5, line 20-p. 6, line 2.

[3] *Hist. Eccl.*, iii, 11, 1. The electoral assembly was obviously in Pella. SCHOEPS, *op. cit.*, 282, n. 1 rejects Eusebius' account. He thinks that Pella must be ruled 'out since it would contradict the information that " the apostles . . . the disciples . . . and the Lord's relatives *met together from all quarters*," which " bei einer Konzentration in Pella sinnlos väre." Why should this be unreasonable ? Is it not rather reasonable to assume that for the important election of a successor to James the leading members of the Church—all of whom were certainly not in Jerusalem—should come together from all quarters? This election was particularly important, since, as explained in the text, the issue between Hebrew and Gentile Christians had been reopened again. SCHOEPS is, of course, compelled to reject Eusebius' account, since he assumes that James was martyred in 63 and Symeon elected as his successor immediately afterwards in Jerusalem.

[4] *Op. cit.*, iv, 22, 4.

it at least that the election of Symeon was contested and that the disruption of the unity of the Church was somehow connected with it. By whom was Symeon's election contested ? Now, since the first breach in the Church occurred as a result of the formation of the Jewish-Christian sect which continued in some respects the tradition of the Hebrew Christians in Jerusalem, we must suppose that Symeon's rival in the election was the leader of the Hebrew Christians. The latter's failure must then have precipitated the crisis ; and he and his followers, being under the impact of the destruction of the Church in Jerusalem—which they regarded as God's punishment of those who " amassed wealth " and " spoke rebellion against " His commandments and as an omen of what would happen in " the last days " to all transgressors of God's laws —decided to separate themselves from the " transgressors " and to secede from the Church.

Was this leader Thebutis ? We know nothing about him except that, according to Hegesippus, he was a Hebrew Christian. Is his a fictitious name adopted to disguise the real identity of the unsuccessful candidate to James' succession ? He must have been a person of high standing in the Church, since he stood for the election as bishop and after his failure was able to conduct in secret the propaganda for the secession from the Church and the adoption of some pre-Christian sectarian customs.

Hegesippus' information about the " secrecy " appears to find support in the following passage of the Discipline Scroll :

> There shall be no argument or dispute with the men of perdition, but the " design " of the Torah shall be concealed from the iniquitous men and the true knowledge and just judgments imparted to those who have chosen the [right] way. . . . This is the time when the way to the desert should be taken. . . .[1]

The motives which led the Hebrew Christian seceders to settle in the desert of the " land of Damascus " were mainly eschatological —as I hope to explain in detail when dealing with the Discipline Scroll on another occasion—and the seceders made apparently some use for their internal organisation of the experience of the Essenes. Hegesippus' account indicates that the breaking up of the unity of the Church and the intrusion of pre-Christian sectarian conceptions began after the election of Symeon, son of Clopas.[2]

The Fragments themselves presuppose as their background the existence of a fully developed and organised Jewish-Christian sect, settled in various " camps "[3] and in a " holy city "[4] ; they also refer to the " Covenant of Damascus " as an event which took place at some time in the past. The date of composition of the Fragments must therefore be much later than the election in Pella in

---

1 Plate ix, lines 16-17, 19.
2 See HILGENFELD (*Zeit. Wis. Theol.*, 1905 ; 48), who assumes that James's death was in 62, and dates this intrusion in the same year.
3 P. 14, line 19.
4 P. 12, lines 1-2. Is this city Cochaba ?

about 70. How much later ? I should like to suggest that a short diversional exploration in another direction might enable us to fix the *terminus ad quem* of the composition of the Fragments.

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

If the preceding reconstruction of the origin and development of the Jewish-Christian sect is correct, it would appear that the election of Symeon to succeed James was a manifestation expressing the victory of the Pauline conception of the Church over the Hebrew Christian point of view. Some light on this matter may perhaps be gained from the answer to the question: Who were the leaders of the Hebrew Christians, " the wise men of Aaron and the sages of Israel " who had received God's warning in Jerusalem and escaped to Pella, and who put up the unsuccessful candidate for the succession of James ? This question is, however, connected with the larger one: Who was the " Messiah from Aaron and Israel " referred to in the Fragments ? This must be dealt with first.

5. THE MESSIAH FROM AARON AND ISRAEL

The identity of this Messiah, who is mentioned several times in the Fragments, has been till now a mystery. R. H. Charles appears to be the only scholar who has tried to solve it without rearranging the text of the Fragments to suit his own preconceived notion. His method of approach is unexceptionable ; he establishes by clear reasoning that, according to the Fragments, " the expected Messiah was to spring from Israel, *i.e.*, from a non-priestly source, on his father's side, and from Aaron, *i.e.*, from a priestly source, on his mother's.[1] Unfortunately, in applying this conclusion to the identification of the Messiah, Charles stops short of the goal and decides that this Messiah is " Alexander and Aristibulos, the sons of Mariamme and Herod."[2] Thus, instead of one Messiah we get two. There is, however, not the slightest hint in any source that either of these sons of Herod, or both together, were ever regarded as the Messiah. The result of Charles' application of his correct genealogical conclusion is in fact purely negative[3] and the right person whom it will fit must yet be found. But before we undertake this task, an obstacle to the correct solution must be removed.

It has been repeatedly asserted by various scholars[4] that the " More Ṣedeq " and the " Messiah from Aaron and Israel " in the Fragments are two different persons. This assertion is, however, not supported by the texts. Quite to the contrary. On the first

---

[1] *The Apocrypha*, Oxford, 1913 ; 795.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] In the recent discussion of the Dead Sea Scrolls, many instances can be found of this peculiar method which consists in accepting results as positive and definitive that are, in fact, merely negative.

[4] Recently by J. VAN DER PLOEG, O.P. in *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, viii, 1 (1951) ; 13.

page of the Fragments we read that at the end of three hundred and ninety years God remembered Israel and made to spring from Israel and Aaron the root of an eternal plant . . .[1] and raised for them [the people of Israel] the " Moreh Ṣedeq." The genealogy of the " Moreh Ṣedeq " thus goes back to both Israel and Aaron. This genealogy, as well as the identification of the " Moreh Ṣedeq " with the " Messiah from Aaron and Israel," is confirmed by the following two passages: *bekhol qeṣ harish'ah . . . 'ad 'amod yoreh ṣedeq be'aharith hayyamim* (p. 6, lines 10-11); *beqeṣ harish'ah 'ad 'amod mashiaḥ [me]aharon weyisra'el* (pp. 12-13, lines 23-1). Here the " yoreh ṣedeq " and the " mashiaḥ " are parallel to and interchangeable with each other.

L. Ginzberg has argued indeed that the expression *yoreh ṣedeq* here refers, as in Talmudic literature, to the reappearance of the prophet Elijah, who will give an answer to all insoluble legal questions.[2] But surely there is nothing in the relevant passage of the Fragment to suggest the slightest concern for insoluble legal problems. In any case the word *yoreh* is almost certainly a copyist's error, since the structure of the sentence requires a noun, not a verb, and we ought to read *moreh*. The previously established identification of Jesus with the " Moreh Ṣedeq " gives further support to the argument that the " Moreh Ṣedeq " and the " Messiah from Aaron and Israel " are one and the same.

The only passage which gives *prima facie* support to the assertion that the Messiah and the *Moreh Ṣedeq* are two different persons reads as follows: ". . . from the day of the ascension of the ' Unique Teacher' to the appearance of the Messiah from Aaron and Israel . . ." (p. 20, line 1). But let us substitute the name of Jesus for that of the " Unique Teacher."[3] The passage now reads ". . . from the day of Jesus' ascension to the appearance of the Messiah from Aaron and Israel . . ." From the point of view of the Christian who believes that Jesus will reappear as the Messiah, this passage certainly does not convey the notion that Jesus and the Messiah are two different persons.

The strongest confirmation that the " Messiah from Aaron and Israel " is the Christian Messiah is found in the following mutilated passage of the Fragment: ". . . the Messiah from Aaron and Israel and he will pardon our sins . . ." (p. 14, line 19). Ginzberg, commenting on this passage, argues that the phrase " and he will pardon our sins " ought not to be joined to the preceding ". . . the Messiah from Aaron and Israel," since " we could not think of ' the Messiah who pardons our sins ' except in reference to a Christian writing."[4] Ginzberg expresses himself even more

---

1 Read *mata'ath 'olam* as in the Discipline Scroll, Plate viii, 5.

2 *MGWJ*, 1914; 400.

3 There can be scarcely any doubt that this term is identical with that of " More Ṣedeq."

4 *MGWJ*, 1912; 670: " ein ' Sündenvergebender Messias ' wäre nur in einem christlichen Werke denkbar."

strongly when, dealing again with this passage, he writes : " There is no evidence in any Jewish source of a Messiah who pardons our sins, and there cannot possibly therefore be any reference in our writing [the Fragments] to the pardon of our sins by the Messiah."[1] But the mention in the Fragments of the Messiah from Aaron and Israel who pardons our sins is, nevertheless, clear and explicit, and cannot be removed from the text by the power of any preconceived notion. We must therefore abide by its statement and conclude that the Fragments represent a Christian, not a Jewish, writing.

But can it be said that Jesus, the Messiah, sprang from Aaron and Israel ? The dominant tradition of the Church is, of course, that Jesus sprang from the royal line of David (Judah), but this tradition submerged the yet older tradition, which was still alive in the Early Church and which is represented, for example, by St. Augustine and Epiphanius, that Jesus' origins were sacerdotal as well as royal and that he was King and High-Priest through his genealogical derivation from the tribe of Judah on his father's side and from the tribe of Levi on his mother's side.[2] Charles' conclusion about the genealogical tree of the Messiah in the Fragments fits only Jesus.

Jesus' brothers, sprung from the union of Joseph and Mary, and their direct descendants were also regarded as deriving from the union of the sacerdotal and royal lines, that is to say, from Aaron and Israel. This is clearly attested by Hegesippus and also by Epiphanius, who insists on the sacerdotal and royal genealogy of James, the brother of Jesus.[3] We must therefore conclude that the " wise men of Aaron and the sages of Israel "—the leaders of the Hebrew Christians in Jerusalem, who, after receiving God's warning, left the city before its destruction—were Jesus' closest relatives, his brothers and their sons, who are referred to in patristic literature as *desposynoi,* meaning, according to J. Weiss, heirs designate to the throne of Jesus the King.

In the light of this conclusion, the election in Pella of Symeon, the son of Clopas, to succeed James, may have had a special significance. For Clopas, Jesus' uncle, was the brother of Joseph, and his son, Symeon, the newly elected bishop, could therefore claim descent only from the Davidic line (Judah). His election therefore, as against that of any of the *desposynoi,* who were, as we have seen above, present at the electoral assembly, may perhaps be regarded as the tangible sign of the victory of the Catholic trend in the Church over the ideals of the Hebrew Christians. The tradition of the purely Davidic descent of Jesus may also have had

---

[1] *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte,* I, New York, 1922 ; 359 : " Der Messias als Sündenvergeber, lässt sich in keiner jüdischen Quelle nachweisen und es kann deshalb auch in unserer Schrift keine Rede von der Sündenvergebung durch den Messias sein."

[2] See the interesting discussion of this whole question in T. ZAHN, *Brüder und Vettern Jesu* in *Forschungen z. Gesch. des neutest. Kanons,* vi (1900) ; 328, n. 2, where the relevant sources are indicated.

[3] *Panarion,* xxix, 3 ; lxxviii, 13.

its beginnings on that occasion. The violent invective of the Fragments against " the princes of Judah " (p. 8, lines 3-9, and p. 19, lines 15-21) may perhaps refer to rulers of the Church who were descended only from David.

Some support for this hypothesis may be found in the letter of Julius Africanus, quoted by Eusebius,[1] in which reference is made to the *desposynoi*.

The Greek text of Eusebius is, unfortunately—as has been pointed out by Schwartz—not free from lacunæ, and, in addition, the meaning of the passage in which it is stated that the *desposynoi* " coming from the Jewish (*Ioudaikōn*) villages of Nazareth and Cochaba travelled over [or, visited frequently] the rest of the land (*epifoitēsantes tē loipē gē*)," is very obscure. Scholars are, in fact, very much divided as to its correct interpretation. Some think that Cochaba is the locality mentioned in patristic literature as the seat of the Jewish Christian sect, but place it in Galilee together with Nazareth. Others deny this identification. Others again see in it a reference to the Christian settlement which occurred first in Nazareth and afterwards in Cochaba.[2] And yet others, like Zahn, think that the *desposynoi* were settled partly in Nazareth and partly in Cochaba in Transjordan, from where they spread " over the rest of the world."[3] It is indeed possible that Julius Africanus intended to refer to the division of the *orbis christianus* at his time (third century) between the Catholic and the Jewish Christians. But Rufinus' Latin translation of Eusebius offers a different text, which gives a clear meaning, referring to the *desposynoi* as those " qui et Nazaraei fuerunt ex vico Cochaba Judaeorum, quique per omnem regionem circumeuntes." From this text we may deduce that the *desposynoi* were Jewish Christians living in Cochaba, the central (?) locality of the sect, who went on pastoral tours in the region. It is very likely therefore that these *desposynoi* were " the wise men from Aaron and the sages from Israel," the leaders of the Hebrew Christians in Jerusalem who escaped to Pella and subsequently, after the election of Symeon, became the founders of the Jewish Christian sect, in opposition to the Catholic Church.

Confirmation of this is supplied by Eusebius' account, derived from Hegesippus, of the two surviving descendants of Jesus' family having been summoned before Domitian, thoroughly examined concerning their manner of life, their worldly goods, and their conception of Christ's Kingdom, and then set free to " lead the churches " (*hēgēsasthai tōn ekklēsiōn*).[4] The last phrase has presented an insurmountable difficulty to scholars, since, at the time of Domitian, the leader of the Church was Symeon, the son of Clopas, and there is no evidence at all that he shared his task with the *desposynoi*. This difficulty disappears at once, however, as soon as we assume that the *desposynoi* were the leaders of the

1 *Hist. Eccl.*, i, 7, 14.
3 *Op. cit.*, 295.
2 See Schoeps, *Theologie*, 273.
4 *Hist. Eccl.*, iii, 19; 20, 1-8.

Jewish Christian seceders and not of the Catholic Christians. Let us now read the account of their life given by the *desposynoi* to the Emperor:

> Then he [Domitian] asked them what possessions they had or what fortune they owned. And they said that between the two of them they had only nine thousand denarii, half belonging to each of them ; and this they asserted they had not in money, but only in thirty-nine plethra of land, so valued, from which by their own labours they both paid the taxes and supported themselves. . . . Then they showed also their hands, and put forward the hardness of their bodies and the callosities formed on their hands from continual working, as a proof of personal labour. . . .[1]

Is not this the kind of life, the realisation of the ideal of evangelical poverty, that we would expect, according to our documents, of the leaders of the Jewish Christians ?

The two *desposynoi* summoned before Domitian were the sons or grandsons (the manuscripts vary on this point)[2] of Jude, the brother of Jesus ; they were called Zōkēr and James (Iakōbos), the latter being perhaps the leader of the Jewish Christians. An allusion to his name may, indeed, be contained in the following passage of the Fragments (p. 7, lines 18-19):

> And the Star (*kokhabh*) is the expounder of the Torah who came to Damascus, as it is written " a star set out from Jacob and a sceptre rose from Israel." [Num. xxiv, 17.]

Or, is the allusion here to Cochaba, the holy city(?) of the Jewish Christians, or to both the city and the leader, Jacob ?

*   *   *

The result of the foregoing exploration enables us to fix the *terminus ad quem* of the composition of the Fragments. The account of their lives given by Zōker and James to Domitian suggests that the Jewish Christian sect was then already settled in its territory and that the conditions reflected in the Fragments already existed. The Fragments then were composed probably not later than the reign of Domitian, 81-96, when the *desposynoi* were still alive, and certainly not later than 107, when the bishop Symeon was executed by order of Trajan, together with all the members of the Jewish royal (Davidic) family. We owe this information to Eusebius, who follows Hegesippus, and the wording of Eusebius' statement significantly supports the hypothesis that the leaders of the Jewish Christian sect were blood relations of Jesus. For Eusebius states that those who denounced the bishop Symeon at the time when search was made for the members of the royal Davidic family, were themselves executed, since they were members of this family (Hist. Eccl. iii, 32, 4).

As it stands this statement is inherently improbable and,

---

1 *Hist. Eccl.*, iii, 19 ; 20, 1-8.   2 ZAHN, *op. cit.*, 240.

indeed, absurd. For why should some members of the royal Davidic family, who were themselves in danger of execution by the Roman authorities, approach these authorities in order to denounce to them other members of the Davidic family and thus reveal themselves ?

In order to explain Eusebius' statement, it is necessary to point out that Eusebius entertained the belief that the descendants of the Davidic family (Jesus' blood relations) were twice denounced to the Roman authorities by Christian sectarians. He asserts this belief when describing not only the execution of Symeon by Trajan (iii, 32, 6) but also the summons of the descendants of Jude before Domitian (Hist. Eccl. iii, 19). He derived this belief, however, not from Hegesippus, who does not mention that the informers were Christian sectarians, but from a tradition current in his time (*palaios katechei logos,* iii, 19), and in his statement about Trajan's persecution he obviously combined this tradition with the account of the execution of Jesus' blood relations which he found in his source (Hegesippus). This source must have contained the information that Jesus' blood relations, who were executed with Symeon, were sectarian Jewish Christians, though not the information that they were informers. Eusebius then intepreted this information in the light of his own tradition about the informers and reached the absurd conclusion that Jesus' blood relations denounced each other to the Roman authorities.

If this line of argument is sound, it corroborates the assertion that Jesus' blood relations were the leaders of the Jewish Christian sect.

It is also of interest to mention that Julian Africanus tells us in his letter that the *desposynoi* in Cochaba had in their possession a writing, called *biblion tōn hemerōn,* " The Book of the Days," which may be identical with the *sefer mahlaqoth ha'ittim,* " Book of the Division of the Days (Seasons)," referred to in the Fragments (p. 16, line 3). The passage in Eusebius containing the quotation from Africanus has, as is mentioned above, lacunæ ; and possibly the full title of the writing in possession of the *desposynoi* was " Book of the Division of the Days," corresponding almost exactly to the Hebrew title in the Fragments. The real title of the " Book of Jubilees," as it appears in the *explicit* of the work, but not in the list of its titles as given by Charles, is " The Account of the Division of the Days," or as in the *incipit,* " The History of the Division of the Days." The correspondance of this title with that mentioned in the Fragments and in Africanus' letter is very striking.

6. A Difficulty and its Solution

The time has come to consider a difficulty that could be raised against the interpretation of the Fragments propounded here. Many scholars have relied on the references in the Fragments to a Sanctuary (*miqdash*), an altar, sacrifice (*'olah*), offering (*minhah*),

incense and wood, in determining the date and the nature of the work. They have assumed that these references can be explained only as relating to a temple in which sacrifices were performed.

But, apart from some references to the Temple contained either in direct quotations from the Bible or in an historical context relating to Solomon's Temple, all these references and expressions are perfectly appropriate for Christians and are used even to-day. Indeed, in the only instance in the Fragments where the phrase *beyth hammiqdash* would certainly have been used by the author had he intended to refer to a temple with a sacrificial cult like the Temple in Jerusalem, the actual expression used by him is *beyth hishtahawoth*, " the house of prostration," that is to say, the house of worship, or adoration, an expression coined probably under the influence of the Greek *proskynēsis*.

7. CONCLUSIONS

It may be convenient to sum up the results of this inquiry into the nature and contents of the Genizah Damascus Fragments and of this exploration of the tortuous paths of early Church history by dealing separately with the patristic and Hebrew sources.

The critical examination of the patristic sources has produced the following picture of the origin of the Jewish Christian sect : After the martyrdom of James in 67 and shortly before the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E., the leaders of the Hebrew Christians in Jerusalem received by divine revelation a warning of the imminent catastrophe and escaped to Pella. Soon after the fall of the city an electoral assembly, composed of the *desposynoi* (Jesus' blood relations) and apostles and disciples of Jesus, met in Pella and chose as a successor to James, Symeon son of Clopas and cousin of Jesus—not one of his closer relatives, although they were present at the assembly. Symeon's election was contested and his success in face of the stronger rights of Jesus' closer relatives—since it is generally agreed that the rule in the early Church was " monarchical "—must be regarded as the external sign of victory of the Pauline trend in the Church over the Hebrew Christian outlook. The secession of the Hebrew Christians from the Church began after the election of Symeon, at first secretly but becoming an open breach when the seceders organised themselves as a separate Jewish Christian sect in the Syrian desert, probably adopting as a model for their external organisation certain Essene institutions. The leaders of the sect were Zōker and James, sons or grandsons of Jude. They lived in Cochaba, were summoned before Domitian but set free and they, or their descendants, were executed together with Symeon in 107 by order of Trajan.

An examination of the Damascus Fragments has shown that this writing is a Jewish Christian product. The references to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E., the escape of the leaders from the city to the " land of the North " (Pella), after receiving a divine warning,

the identification of Jesus with the " Messiah from Aaron and Israel " and the recognition that the " Covenant of Damascus " was the charter of the Jewish Christian sect—all these facts, which are in complete accordance with the information contained in patristic sources, establish the nature and origin of the Fragments beyond any doubt. This result confirms the conclusion reached in my previous paper about the character of the Fragments themselves and the Habakkuk Scroll. Although the special study of the Discipline Scroll has been reserved for a future occasion, enough has been said about this Scroll in the present study to justify its identification as another Jewish Christian writing.

These newly disclosed Hebrew writings of the Jewish Christian sect confirm the information contained in the patristic sources about the origin of the sect as against the opinion of modern scholars, and add the new information, derived from the Habakkuk Scroll, that the Hebrew Christians in Jerusalem, whose opposition to the Pauline trend in the Church was probably kept within bounds by James, broke out, after the latter's death, with a violent attack on the followers of Paul. But the main value of the Hebrew sources lies in the opportunity they offer us for the first time to understand the inner motives of the Hebrew Christians' opposition to Paul and the reasons which led them to separate themselves from the Church. The Hebrew Christians opposed Paul because he abandoned Moses' laws as accepted (and interpreted) by Jesus and because the collections from Gentile converts " defiled " the sanctity of the Church and led to the accumulation of wealth, which was contrary to the ideal of evangelical poverty. The destruction of the Church in Jerusalem in 70 c.e., regarded by the Hebrew Christians as a punishment from God for the misdeeds of the followers of Paul, determined the Hebrew Christians' decision, which was also strengthened by eschatological expectations, to secede from the Church after their failure at Pella to impose their own point of view. The Catholic Church drew quite different conclusions from the destruction of Jerusalem.

The legal and the homiletic components of the Fragments presuppose the existence of a developed and well-organised Jewish Christian sect. They were composed not later than the end of the first century. The original scroll from which the copyists of the Fragments transcribed their text must have been written down very much later, at a time when the homilies and precepts of the sect had disintegrated into fragments. A long period of time must have elapsed before this process of disintegration was accomplished. The original scroll of our Fragments was therefore probably not written down before the second or the beginning of the third century. The same considerations apply to the Discipline Scroll, which exhibits the same fragmentariness and incoherence as the Fragments. It, too, was written down not earlier than the second or the beginning of the third century.

Before leaving this examination of the Fragments I should like to draw attention to the great profit that can be gained for the understanding of the Scrolls from the study of the New Testament and early Christian literature. Several scholars have already remarked on the interesting parallels between this literature on the one hand and the Hymns and Discipline Scroll on the other hand. The doctrine of predestination in the Letter to the Ephesians offers another very striking parallel. An instance of how aptly the Scrolls and the Fragments can be illustrated from Christian literature may be mentioned here because it confirms that we are dealing in both cases with the same range of ideas. In the Discipline Scroll (iii, 17-25) we read that God

> created man for dominion over the world and assigned him two Spirits with whom to walk until the appointed time of His visitation. They are the Spirits of Truth and Evil. Truth was born in the abode of Light and Evil sprang from the depths of Darkness. The Prince of Light rules over all the sons of Truth [or Righteousness] who walk in the paths of Light and the Angel of Darkness rules over the sons of Evil who walk in the paths of Darkness. From the Angel of Darkness comes the seduction of the sons of Truth and from his dominion all their sins, iniquities, offences, and rebellious deeds— as has been decreed by divine mystery—until the time appointed by Him. All the sufferings and times of tribulation of the sons of Truth proceed from the dominion of the Angel of Mastema (Satan), appointed by God, and all the spirits allotted to him [demons] are bent on seducing the sons of Light to sin, but the God of Israel and His angel of Truth assist all sons of Light.

The same conception of the division of power—decreed by God—between the Prince of Light, or Angel of Truth, who assists the sons of Light, and Satan, the Angel of Darkness, who is the source of corruption and evil and from whom all suffering proceeds, is the leading motif of the Clementine Homilies. Thus, for example, Peter, referring to the diseases which Simon, Satan's representative, inflicted on the people of Tyre after they had participated in a sacrificial feast, indicates to the afflicted the remedy:

> Now I have been told, that after Simon had sacrificed an ox he feasted you in the middle of the forum, and that you made friends ... not only with the evil demons, but their prince also, and that in this way the most of you were seized by these sicknesses, unwittingly drawing upon yourselves with your own hands the sword of destruction. For the demons would never had power over you, had not you first supped with their prince. For thus from the beginning was a law laid by God, the Creator of all things, on each of the two princes, him of the right hand and him of the left, that neither should have power over anyone whom they might wish to benefit or to hurt, unless first he had sat down at the same table with them. As, then, when you partook of meat offered to idols, you became servants to the prince of evil, in like manner, if you cease from these things, and flee for refuge to God through the good prince of His right hand ... know of a truth

that not only will your bodies be healed, but your souls also will become healthy.[1]

In the Fragments (p. 16, lines 4-5), too, the return to Gods' law frees man from the dominion of the Angel of " Mastemah." Another difficult passage of the Fragments (p. 5, lines 17-19) can now, despite its fragmentary state, be fully explained:

> . . . For in ancient times Moses and Aaron stood under the dominion of the Prince of Light and Belial raised in his guile Yohaneh and his brother against them ; [this happened] when Israel was saved for the first time [read : 'et]. . . .

Yohaneh and his brother, Mamre, are the two Egyptian magicians who, according to a widely diffused legend, withstood Moses and Aaron during the liberation of the Jews from Egypt.[2] The author of the homily in the Fragments regards the contest between them and Moses and Aaron as the contest between the Prince of Light and Belial or between Truth and Falsehood.

The Recognitions of Clement (iii, 56) also regard Moses' fight in Egypt in the same light:

> For as then, when Moses exhorted the king to believe God, the magicians opposed him . . . and so kept back the unbelievers from salvation, so also now . . . Simon the magician resists me [Peter], acting in opposition to me, as they also did in opposition to Moses. . . .[3]

The contest in Egypt between the Prince of Light and Belial— through their respective agents, the two magicians and Moses and Aaron—is also regarded by the author of the Fragments as a symbol conveying to him the explanation of the character of his own age. It is the age in which the agents of Belial contend against the truth like their forebears in Egypt, but they will not prevail.

In II Timothy, at the beginning of chapter 3, the evil doings of men " in the last days " are also described, by reference to the two Egyptian magicians, as a contest against truth:

> Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth ; men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith.

<div align="right">

J. L. TEICHER
</div>

Cambridge

---

1 VII, 3. Compare also chapter 6: " For I have learned from the True Prophet the conditions fore-ordained by God before the foundation of the world ; that is to say, if men do evil deeds—He has ordained that they shall be injured by the Prince of Evil."

2 See SCHECHTER, Zadokite Work, 37 and 59.

3 Compare also The Book of Jubilees (CHARLES, Apocrypha, 79, 9): " And the Prince Mastema stood up against thee [Moses], and sought to cast thee into the hands of Pharaoh, and he helped the Egyptian sorcerers, and they stood up and wrought against thee."

THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH

The rediscovery of the Samaritan Pentateuch (S) in the seventeenth century caused a stir amongst Biblical scholars.[1] A new and valuable version of the Pentateuch was made available which differed from the MT and showed moreover affinities with the Septuagint (G) in some 2,000 readings out of more than 6,000 divergencies from the former.[2] Scholars became convinced that these features further justified the assumption of a pre-massoretic text of the Pentateuch, remnants of which were preserved in S and G.[3] The Samaritans were known to be a rather conservative and secluded community and had therefore been able, it was said, to preserve the Pentateuch in an early textual form, which preceded considerably the MT. According to Josephus—if his account can be accepted as correct—the Torah was transferred to the Samaritans not later than the days of Alexander the Great. The Temple on Har Gerizim was then built and Manasseh, the renegate Jewish priest, who was compelled to flee from Jerusalem, brought a copy of the Torah to the Samaritan community.[4] This copy escaped the redaction of Jabneh,[5] when the Rabbis fixed the standard version of the Jewish Pentateuch and made it conform—it is alleged—with their own views and conceptions. The two testimonies of S and G —both of which are supposed to contain ancient readings—seemed to carry sufficient weight to warrant the view that the MT should be regarded as a definitely late version. Some scholars, like Morinus, would prefer the linguistic and stylistic peculiarities of S to those of the MT ; the former is considered to have preserved the earlier and unaffected characters of the Hebrew language, whilst the latter betrays the revising influence of the Jewish savants. Kennicott even went so far as to accept the " typically Samaritan " variants—such as the altered form of the Ten Commandments which includes a proclamation of the holiness of Har Gerizim—as being the original. In his opinion it was the Jews who adapted the early text to their own requirements, namely, to their conception of the sanctity of Jerusalem and later religious rulings.[6]

[1] See the account in J. A. MONTGOMERY, *The Samaritans*, 1907; pp. 1-13.

[2] EISSFELDT, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1934; p. 700.

[3] MONTGOMERY, *op. cit.*, pp. 286-290, and the bibliography cited there.

[4] This is not stated in Josephus' account of the story (*Antiq. xi, 7, 2*), but " modern criticism connects with this Manasseh the alleged adoption by the Samaritans of the Pentateuch which the former is supposed to have brought with him." (M. GASTER, *The Samaritans*, Schweich Lectures, 1923; p. 30.) See also MONTGOMERY, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-71.

[5] MONTGOMERY, *op. cit.*, p. 289. P. KAHLE, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes* in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken xxviii (1915); The Cairo Geniza*, Schweich Lectures, 1941, pp. 144-149.

[6] MONTGOMERY, *op. cit.*, pp. 288-289.

The tide turned against the Samaritan version when Gesenius[1] published his well-known treatise. He endeavoured to prove by painstaking comparisons that S was inferior to the MT. Far from preserving the original text of the Torah, it was based—in his opinion—on the MT and edited according to rules suiting the Samaritans' Hebrew dialect and their religious outlook. Though Gesenius was probably wrong in some of his interpretations and explanations, his sound, scholarly approach introduced a more critical attitude into the discussion in which the issues had been obscured by religious prepossessions. It looked at first as if Gesenius' exposition had settled the question.

However, the old problem became prominent again when, as a result of new discoveries—for example, the Cairo Genizah—the quest for the pre-massoretic text of the Bible regained its impetus. Biblical quotations preserved in post-Biblical literature which had not been submitted to the massoretic revision, as, for example, in the " Apocrypha," in Jewish-Greek writings, in patristic literature, etc., varied often from the textus receptus and sometimes coincided with the Samaritan version. Kahle, amongst others, laboured hard to restore the faith in the genuineness and antiquity of the Samaritan text.[2]

The latest to follow the lead of these scholars is Gerleman.[3] The result of his study may be summed up as follows: In the Samaritan Pentateuch we find embodied the text of the Torah as it was extant in the pre-Christian era. Its textual form is therefore considerably earlier than the MT, the characteristic features of which were fixed in Jabneh.[4] Gerleman's approach is purely linguistic and stylistic. He is not concerned with historical questions but only with synoptic studies. His main contribution towards the definition of the relationship between the MT, S, and G seems to lie in the application of an inner-Biblical synopsis to our problem. Following up his assumption that S is in the main a pre-massoretic text, he discovers significant syntactical and textual similarities between S and the massoretic Book of Chronicles.[5] Moreover, a comparative study of variants in the parallel passages in Chron. and Sam.-Kings reveals a striking identity of character with the

---

1 W. Gesenius, *De Pentateuchi Samaritani Origine,* 1815.

2 Kahle, *Geniza,* pp. 143-148; *Untersuchungen,* p. 3 ff.

3 G. Gerleman, *Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament;* Lunds Universitets Arsskrift N.F. And. 1. Bd. 44; 1948.

4 *Op. cit.,* pp. 4-5; 12-13.

5 See, for example, the identical spelling of names: Gen. x, 4, MT: *we-Dodanim* ; S: *weRodanim* = I Chron. i, 7. Gen. x, 28, MT: *'Obhal*; S: *'Eybhal* = I Chron. i, 22. Compr. also Gen. x, 8-I Chron. i, 10; x, 15-i, 13; xxv, 4-i, 33; xxxvi, 39-i, 50 etc. (*op. cit.,* p. 10). S and Chron. prefer a syndetic construction to the asyndetic of the MT, except in enumerations where the former often employ a " pairing " structure instead of the complete syndesis of the latter (*op. cit.,* p. 10-11). The employment of plene writing is much more prominent in S and Chron. than in the massoretic Pentateuch (*op. cit.,* pp. 12-14). A peculiarity common to both S and Chron. is the imperf. consec. which is rare in the MT (*op. cit.,* pp. 14-15).

variations found between S and the Pentateuchal MT.[1]   Whilst the
readings in Chron. indicate a popular and early text, the text of
Sam.-Kings shows traces of having been established in conformity
with the requirements of a later period.[2]   Reasoning on these lines
Gerleman reaches the following conclusions: MT is a polished and
faultless " textus receptus "; S represents the " vulgar and erratic "
version, resulting from popular use.   This version offers us a
valuable specimen of the pre-Christian Hebrew language which
should be ranged alongside with Chronicles.[3]   It is easily explained
why S and Chronicles were not affected by the rabbinic revision:
the version of the Samaritan dissenters did not come under the
jurisdiction of the Rabbis, and Chronicles, in comparison with the
" prophetic " books of Sam.-Kings, were considered less holy and
did not solicit special attention from the Rabbis.

Gerleman admits that Sam.-Kings as well as the massoretic
Pentateuch represent a fairly early linguistic tradition, and that
Chron. and S betray rather late linguistic features.   But according
to him, the Rabbis aimed at an archaising reconstruction of their
text in order to enhance its holiness.   The stylistic archaisms in the
MT and Sam.-Kings and the grammatical smoothness of those
books are, in fact, but the result of the famous scholarly revision
at Jabneh.   Gerleman does not dispute that this " re-fashioning "
was probably based on reliable traditions preserved in the rabbinic
schools.

There are, thus, three stages discernible in the history of the
Pentateuch.   The first, the " Ur-Pentateuch," is lost without leaving
traces.   The second is embodied in the " vulgar and erratic "
Samaritan text;[4] it is substantiated by readings of G and scattered
references in post-Biblical literature.   MT represents the third stage.

The weakness of Gerleman's thesis lies in his characterisation
of Chron. and S, which he describes as an " erratic and vulgar " text,
deteriorated as a result of uncontrolled handling by the people.
This implies a revolutionary attitude towards Chron.   But this
book has long been recognised as embodying a systematised text.
In this very book, more than in others, including Sam.-Kings,
scholars have discovered emendations of late editors who intended
to produce a linguistically and exegetically straightforward text.[5]
Again S has been similarly viewed since Gesenius' days.   Far from

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 12-23.

[2] This, amongst other reasons, accounts for the *ketib-qeri'* variants.   The
Chronicler's readings often correspond to the *qeri'* variants in Sam.-Kings—
remnants of pre-Christian readings, superseded by the artificial massoretic *ketib*
(*op. cit.*, p. 27).

[3] *Op. cit.*, pp. 19-21.

[4] GERLEMAN applies the same considerations to the Greek translations of
Sam.-Kings and Chron.   These books betray the influence of a " vulgar and
erratic " original from which they derived.   Chron. (Greek and Hebrew),
together with Sam.-Kings (Greek), represent a tradition which differs in linguistic
and textual details from Sam.-Kings (Hebrew).

[5] S. R. DRIVER, *An Introduction to the Literature of the O.T.*, 1920; pp. 525-
540.   A. E. WELCH, *The Work of the Chronicler*, Schweich Lectures, 1938.
A. BENTZEN, *Introduction to the O.T.* II, 1948; pp. 211-216.

being " erratic " both these texts show a conformity to grammatical rules which is not to be found in their prophetic and massoretic parallels respectively.

A few indications might suffice to recall well-established facts concerning S. The employment of plene and defective writing is relatively fixed. Indeed, there is a tendency in S to prefer the full spelling, though this feature is not as prominent as in Mishnaic Hebrew.[1] But whilst the MT might use the same word in the same sentence once in plene and once in defective spelling, S is more consistent and harmonises such instances as, for example, in Gen. i, 14, 15, 16 ; vii, 2 ; viii, 20. The conjunction will often be found in S, where the MT uses an asyndetic construction. G coincides here largely with S.[2]

Again S seems to work according to set rules, whereas the principles of the MT seem, to the contrary, to be rather " erratic." Scholars have tried to explain in various ways the discrepancies in gender and number between subject, predicate, and attributes, which form such a disconcerting peculiarity of the MT. These irregularities will seldom be encountered in the Samaritan version.[3] Collective nouns are treated somewhat haphazardly by the Massoretes. The number of verbs and adjectives connected with them is flexible

---

[1] It should be born in mind that Samaritan MSS. differ sometimes from one another in respect of plene and defective spelling, though on the whole the tendency towards a full spelling is definitely predominant. The standard edition of the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch (v.GALL, 1914) is apt to mislead, as the editor adopted the defective readings in cases of divergencies between MSS. (*op. cit.,* p. lxviii), without recording, in some cases, the plene spelling in the apparatus (see : *Vorwort*). The John Ryland's Library Samaritan Pentateuch MS., written in 1211 which was not consulted by v.GALL (see p. xxxviii), has generally a fuller spelling than the one adopted by v.GALL. In this MS. a later preference for defective writing is to be remarked. In Gen. alone a second hand erased, in at least three instances, a *waw* which is to be found neither in the MT, nor in v.GALL's text, nor in PETERMANN's list of variants. (See : *Versuch einer hebraeischen Formenlehre nach der Aussprache der heutigen Samaritaner,* 1868 ; pp. 219-326.) In Gen. xxxvii, 29, 30 and xlii, 24, MT ; v.GALL and PETERMANN read *wyshb*, whereas MS. Manch. spells *wyshwb*. The erasion of the *waw* indicates an attempt to make S conform with M.T. v.GALL mentions in his apparatus two more MSS. (O and G¹) which retained the *waw* in two of the three instances in which the letter was erased in the Manch MS. and another three MSS. which have the letter in a passage different from the latter. M. GASTER (*A Samaritan Scroll of the Hebrew Pentateuch, PSBA.* xxii, 1900, p, 254) found in his MS., written as a scroll and not in the ordinary book form, 68 cases where S has the plene reading as against the defective spelling of the MT, whereas in 24 instances the situation is reversed.

[2] GERLEMAN, *op. cit.,* pp. 10-12. A few indications of this tendency in the first chapters of Gen.: i, 11 (comp. i, 12) ; i, 26 ; iii, 16 ; vi, 4, 9, 15, 19 ; vii, 3 ; viii, 17, 19. In all these cases G runs parallel with S. The Manch. MS., supported by PETERMANN and 17 MSS. in v.GALL's apparatus, adds the copula in Gen. v, 32 and vi, 10, where v.GALL's text conforms with the MT and G in an asyndetic construction. It should, however, be stated that in some cases S and G have the asyndetic construction, whilst the MT employs the copula, Gen. vii, 13 ; ix, 18. But here we seem to be confronted with special cases. KROPAT maintains that in Chron. the syndetic structure is prevalent (*Die Syntax des Authors der Chron. verglichen mit der seiner Quellen, BZAW.* lxi [1907]).

[3] GERLEMAN, *op. cit.,* pp. 16-17 ; GESENIUS, *op. cit.,* p. 28. A few examples from Ex. may be adduced here. In these cases S reads a verb form in agreement with the number of the subject, whereas the MT is less " regular ": vi, 29 ; xiv, 25 ; xv, 9 ; xvii, 2. This type of congruity is to be found in Chron. as well. See : KROPAT, *op. cit.,* pp. 8-13.

and apparently influenced by the context. S, on the other hand, strives to establish a more consistent treatment and, in most cases, deliberately chooses between given possibilities. Once accepted, a definite number will be used predominantly in connection with the collective noun concerned.[1]   A study of Hebrew grammar based on this text is definitely less complicated than a study based on the massoretic text.

The identity of S with *qeri'* variants of the MT also indicates that the Samaritan Pentateuch contains a version in which faulty or difficult readings were eliminated.[2]   The thorough revision of S can be recognised in matters concerning the conception of God.   The structurally plural form *'Elhym* is in this version always connected with singular verbs and adjectives,[3] whilst the MT retained plural forms, which might convey to the uninitiated reader a polytheistic notion of God.   Finally, we may mention the endeavour of S to achieve a textual harmony, which accounts for a good number of variants from the MT.   In the later stories and reports of the Pentateuch, there are references to earlier occurrences, which are often supported by a corresponding text found in the MT.[4]

In view of these facts it seems paradoxical to maintain that the massoretic version is the product of a deliberately archaising tendency which, curiously enough, resulted in an inaccurate and " erratic " text, betraying signs of antiquity.   It will be admitted, on the other hand, that S was certainly not redacted by the Rabbis and is therefore in some respect a non-scholarly text.   It might be styled " popular," if we can assume that it was not submitted to a parrallel revision by the hands of Samaritan savants, at least not in its early history.   But S is far from being " erratic."   As found in extant MSS. this version represents a much more revised text than the MT.   It runs comparatively smoothly, conforms with the rules of grammar and eliminates readings which might cause consternation and embarrassment.   It bears all the signs of a version that was adapted for popular use from an original unsuitable for this purpose.

This brings us to the question of the " vulgarity " of S.   We can readily agree with Gerleman in adopting this description if it means that S is a popularised version of the presupposed original of the Pentateuch.   The features, recorded above, show that S was meant to serve an audience which could not be burdened with scholarly investigations into their Bible.   The need for a Pentateuch, accessible to the ordinary public, brought about in the end the Aramaic, Greek, Syriac, and other translations of the Bible, at a time when the difficulties in understanding the text were mainly linguistic, though not exclusively so.   Oddities of content and style

---

[1] In Chron. " werden Kollektiva im Gegensatz zur aelteren Sprache fast ausnahmslos mit dem Plural konstruiert." KROPAT, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-30.

[2] GERLEMAN, op. cit., p. 24.

[3] Gen. xx, 13 ; xxxi, 53 ; xxxv, 7 ; Ex. xxii, 8.

[4] S has an appropriate addition after Ex. vi, 8, which corresponds to Ex. xiv, 12.

had also to be removed from those versions of the Torah, in order to make the access to the " Holy Writ " possible without consulting non-scriptural commentaries. In this respect S falls in line with those translations, in the sense that it is a popular edition of the Pentateuch in the Hebrew language. This edition was basically a codification of a " vulgar " textual form which had developed in Palestine and gradually absorbed later and common features of the Hebrew vernacular.[1] To this extent the text was probably " erratic " at the start. But it seems nevertheless obvious that a " codification " of these new developments had subsequently taken place since the text which the Samaritan version presents to us to-day is definitely " arranged."

Torczyner maintains in an interesting study[2] that the Talmud still bears witness to the development indicated above. The well-known passage in Bab. Sanh. 21 b,[3] dealing with the question which *ketabh* is earlier, *'ibhrith* or *'ashurith*, contains the sentence :

בררו להם לישראל כתב אשורית ולשון הקודש והניחו להדיוט ת כתב עברית ולשון ארמי. מאן ׳הדיוטות? אמר רב חסדא כותאי.

" They chose for Israel the Assyrian *ketabh* and the Hebrew language and left to *hedyototh* the Hebrew *ketabh* and the Aramaic language. Who are *hedyototh* ? R. Hisda said : *kutay'*."

Torczyner contends that *ketabh* refers not to the shapes of letters,[4] but means " The Writ," in our case " the Torah." This contention is supported by the circumstance that the usually masculine noun *ketabh* is here combined with feminine adjectives. Accordingly, we seem to have in this passage a rabbinical account of the cleavage between *Israel*—the Jews and *hedyototh-kutay'* : the Samaritans. (Though *kutay'* is not always used in this sense the identity seems to be fairly certain in this instance.) The cleavage was symbolised by the allocation of one copy of the Torah to the Samaritans and another to the Jews. The context makes it clear that the Jewish copy was the one brought by Ezra the Scribe from Babylon. The Samaritan copy, on the other hand, had not gone through the transitory stage of the Babylonian exile. Of this copy it is said that it was *'ibhrith*, whereas the Jewish copy was *'ashurith*, a name given to it because, as explained later, it returned with them from Assur (Babylon). The other copy was left to the *hedyototh*, an expression which contains a characterisation of the people to whom it applies ; it means " the laymen," in contrast to the *hakhamim* : the sages. Although the agents are not expressly mentioned in this passage it seems fair to conjecture that the subject of

1 KAHLE, *Geniza*, pp. 147-148.
2 *Ketabh hatorah* in *hallashon wehassefer*, Jerusalem, pp. 102-142.
3 Two slightly different versions are to be found in *Jer. Meg.* i, 9 and *Tos. Sanh.* iv, 7.
4 A few examples, mainly from Paralipom : Ez. xiii, 9 ; Est. iii, 14 ; iv, 8 ; vii, 8, 13 ; ix, 27 ; Dn. x, 21 ; Ezr. ii, 62 ; iv, 7 ; Neh. vii, 64 ; II Chron. ii, 10 ; xxxv, 4. Against these may be adduced Est. i, 22 ; iii, 12 ; ix, 9, where *ketabh* means " script."

" they chose . . . and left . . ." refers to the spiritual leaders of the Jewish community in the days of the Return, presumably the Soferim. They dissociated themselves from the *hedyototh* and their copy of the Torah and " chose for Israel " that version of the Torah which had been kept under their supervision during the Exile in Babylon.

The " plain people's Torah " contained a " modernised " version of the Law. Having been subjected to the influence of the gradually developing Hebrew language it had absorbed features not to be found in the *ketabh 'ashurith*. The latter had become a somewhat archaic version, a scholarly preservation of the early text.

This " vulgar version " (or versions) was originally Jewish. It came to be called the " Samaritan version " when the Jewish scholars decided to suppress any text not conforming with *'ashurith*. This decision might have been influenced by the intention to mark clearly the dividing line between official Jewry and dissenters. The outlawed versions lingered on and left their imprints in non-official literature which either preceded the decision or was not affected by it. These versions became " standard texts " whenever they began to be considered as " traditional " in an organised community.

S is originally a vulgar version of the Torah in which popular trends were systematised and which, at the crucial point of its history, was provided with a " typical Samaritan " superstructure.

<div style="text-align: right">S. TALMON.</div>

Leeds.

STUDIES IN THE ST. MARK'S ISAIAH SCROLL, III

MASORETIC חֵמָה IN ISAIAH XLII, 25

A

It is only natural that the amateur and sometimes even the scholar became so excited by the discovery reported in April, 1948, of the Isaiah and other Scrolls in the Ayn Feshkha cave, that they almost automatically began to describe some of the innumerable variations in the Isaiah Scroll from the masoretic text as " interesting," " remarkable," and even " original." Actually, never was proof adduced that the reading in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll (hereafter designated DSI) was even a legitimate variant of that in the masoretic text (hereafter indicated by MT), let alone a superior reading. DSI was automatically, and quite gratuitously, accepted and treated as an equal partner of MT; and since MT no longer had " news " value, whereas DSI most decidedly rated front-page treatment, the quite new and " intruiging " readings in the latter pushed the corresponding readings in MT into the background.

I have dealt with several of these variations elsewhere. In " Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll " (*JLB*, 69, June, 1950 ; 149-66. Hereafter indicated by " Studies I ") I discussed DSI *ḥwshb* for MT *ya'aseh* in xxxii, 6; DSI *hyh* for MT *yihyeh* in xliii, 10 ; DSI *ntybym* for MT *neharoth* in xliii, 19 ; DSI *ywdy'* for MT *yari'a* in xlii, 13. In " Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll, II " (to be published in *JNES*), I analysed DSI *yṣryḥw* for MT *yiṣwaḥu* in xlii, 11. I have completed for publication elsewhere a detailed study of Isa. xlii-xliii and the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll. The present study will deal with DSI *ḥmt 'fy'* for MT *ḥemah 'apo* in xlii, 25.

A few preliminary remarks may be in order here: (1) The value of the text of DSI should be studied apart from the problem of date. An old manuscript can constitute a text which is decidedly inferior to that of a younger manuscript (see pp. 150-51 of " Studies I "). An essentially inductive approach to the text of DSI would have resulted in a very considerably less favourable estimate of its textual value. (2) Even before the primary versions of Isaiah were carefully studied, some scholars rushed into print to state that the text of DSI showed definite affinity to the Hebrew *Vorlagen* of the Septuagint, Targum, Peshitta, Vulgate, and the Minor Versions, where these *Vorlagen* differed from MT. The basis of this assertion was usually a sporadic word or two, not infrequently hastily compared with a footnote in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*³—a critical

apparatus to the Hebrew Bible which is all too frequently quite inadequate and even misleading.[1]

Thus, *e.g.*, contrary to Kittel's note on xxxii, 6, " G L T— *yahashābh*," L (the Old Latin—a secondary version!) indicates nothing more than the reading in G, and neither G nor T read *yḥshb* (see my " Studies I," 152-55). Again, because DSI at xl, 7-8, is guilty of a rather obvious case of haplography, where G too has experienced, either already in its Hebrew *Vorlage* or in one of its own early Greek manuscripts, a similar case of haplography, P. Kahle hastened to observe that G's Hebrew *Vorlage* and DSI had much original material in common as against MT.[2] The fact is that DSI is notorious for its omissions (as of its additions ; cf. Burrows, *BASOR*, 111, 16-20 ; Reider, *JQR*, 41, July 1950, 64-5)—which G, incidentally, does not share!—and a more patient and sober study of DSI and G would have shown how reckless and baseless the idea of associating DSI with G's Hebrew *Vorlage* really was. An attempt has been made to show that some of DSI's unique readings conform to old, pre-masoretic Biblical Hebrew syntax (cf. the references submitted by Sperber for Burrows' article in *JBL*, 68, 1949 ; 195-211). I have dealt with several of these variations in " Studies I " (§ 14, pp. 159-60 and nn. 11-12), where the reader may study for himself the reasons for regarding them as quite secondary to MT.

B

Isa. xlii, 25, reads in the preserved text: *wayyishpokh 'alayw hemah 'apo we'ezuz milḥamah* ; and DSI reads: *wyshfwkh 'lyw ḥmt 'fw' w'wzz mlḥmh.*

Scholars have long felt that the original reading was not *hemah 'apo* but *ḥamath 'apo,* " the fury of His anger." Evidence for this seemed to derive both from Biblical Hebrew syntax and from the versions (G *orgen thumou autou ;* T *ḥemath rugzeh ;* P *ḥamtha drugzeh ;* V *indignationem furoris sui*) ; to which might be added the reading *ḥamath 'apo* in Kenn. 1. De Rossi (*Variae Lectiones V.T.*, Vol. III, ad loc.) put it this way, " Melius *ḥamath* in statu constructo Kenn. 1, quia sequitur *'apo* " ; and Torrey, among many modern scholars, " Read *ḥamath* instead of *ḥemah,* with all the old versions " (*The Second Isaiah,* ad loc. ; so also currently L. Koehler, *Lexicon in V.T. libris,* Part v, p. 309b).[3]

---

[1] Cf. pp. 149-155 of my chapter on *Current Progress and Problems in Septuagint Research* (in *The Study of the Bible To-day and To-morrow,* ed. H. R. WILLOUGHBY, Chicago, 1947), and n. 5 in " Studies I."

[2] Cf. his statement in *ThLZ,* 1949 (No. 2), col. 93, " Millar Burrows hat gelegentlich auf eine Ubereinstimmung der Rolle mit der Vorlage der lxx hingewiesen, aber schon die wenigen nun zur Verfügung stehenden Kapitel (*viz.,* *BASOR*, 111, Oct., 1948) zeigen, dass diese Hinweise ganz unzulänglich sind. . . ."

[3] A partial list of those who read *ḥamath* may be found on p. 133 of CHEYNE's *Isaiah* in HAUPT's *Polychrome Bible Series.* Other scholars have resorted to more drastic action. Thus DUHM, followed by MARTI, would excise *ḥemah* altogether (" entweder als stehen gebliebener Schreibfehler . . . oder als Variante zu *milhamah* anzusehen und zu streichen "). EHRLICH (*Randglossen,* etc.) excises *hemah* " als Korrektur des folgenden *milhamah,*" and then emends *milhamah* to *hemah* (" Die Korrektur ist richtig. . . .")!

Among the scholars who explain *hemah 'apo* is David Qimhi (died 1235): " 'And He poured out ': Because Israel sinned before Him, He poured out wrath upon her. (The construction) *hemah 'apo* is equivalent to *hemah ba'apo* ' (He poured out) wrath in His fury.' Or it may be regarded as in place of the construct form, as though he said *hemath 'apo* ' the wrath of His fury.' And similar are the expressions *ke'efah se'orim* ' (And it was) about an ephah of barley ' (Ruth ii, 17), *'asefah 'assir* ' a gathering of prisoners '(Isa. xxiv, 22)."[1]

When I first saw *hmt* in DSI my immediate reaction was to consider it as additional evidence to that offered by the versions and Kenn. I in favour of an original *hamath*. However, more careful study has convinced me that there is good enough reason to believe that *hamath 'apo* cannot be original, and that MT *hemah 'apo*, although there may be more than one grammatically correct explanation of the construction, is thoroughly acceptable.

C

The striking fact seems to have been overlooked that out of no less than 121 instances of *hemah* in the Bible, only in our passage this word appears to have been used in construct to another word of similar meaning (*viz., 'af*). On the other hand, there are scores of passages (see pp. 402-3 in Mandelkern's Concordance) where forms of *hemah* are used in conjunction and in parallelism with *'af*. It would seem that if an Israelite wished to say the equivalent of " fury of his anger," he resorted to *haron 'apo* (cf. Kenn. 384, in n. 8 below) ; and for the expression " his anger was kindled (or, burned, raged) " he employed *wayyihar 'apo*. He did not use, for whatever reason, *hamath 'apo* or *wayyiham 'apo*, any more than we do not say in English " the anger of his fury " or " his fury became angry " or the like.[2] Consequently, such an expression as *haron apo* is no analogy at all, much less proof, for the possibility of an expression *hamath 'apo* ; and I do not know how one could prove that this phrase is genuinely Biblical.

The structure of our verse does not suffer at all if we construe *'apo* as parallel to *hemah*, and divide the verse so as to arrive at a 3:3 meter: ‖ אפו ועזוז מלחמה וישפך עליו חמה.[3] A similar structure may be found, *e.g.*, in x, 25.

---

1 Cf. also, *e.g.*, p. 118, n. 8, in BACHER, *Abraham ibn Esra als Grammatiker* (1882). Some modern scholars have argued along the lines of Qimhi. Thus whereas some would emend *hemah* to *behemah* (so, *e.g.*, Ges.-Buhl13), others would regard *hemah* as equivalent to *behemah* (so, *e.g.*, FRANZ DELITZSCH, *Commentar*, etc., p. 441). KISSANE (*The Book of Isaiah*, ii, pp. 44-5) retains MT *hemah 'apo*, but renders it as though *hamath 'apo* (" the heat of His wrath "). Cf. below on Saadia, JPS, and Ziegler.

2 Idiom can by no means always be accounted for. Thus whereas the absolute form *'af* is found six times in the Bible with (*ba*)*hori* (see MANDELKERN, p. 426a), I do not know of a single case of *'af* so used in the suffixed forms (*bahori 'apo*, or the like).

3 Note the possibly intentional use of *hemah* at the end of both stichs ; as DELITZSCH put it, " In v, 25 ist die genit. Verbindung *hamath 'apo* viell. zu Gunsten des Zusammenklangs von *hema* und *milhamah* vermieden . . ." (—if *hamath 'apo* really is a legitimate Biblical expression!).

Qimḥi's explanation of *ḥemah 'apo* as equivalent to *ḥamath 'apo* is not as unlikely as may seem at first glance. A good analogy would be *ḥemah yaṣ'ah* in Jer. xxiii, 19 ; xxx, 23, which T renders by *birgaz,* and the Jewish Publication Society Translation by " in fury." This idea is expressed also in Isa. lxvi, 15 : *lehashibh beḥemah 'apo* (rendered in JPS, " To render His anger with fury,") and in Ezek. xxxviii, 18 : *ta'aleh ḥamathi be'api.*[1]

While the versions *may* derive from a reading *ḥamath 'apo,* one cannot deny that once *ḥemah* was taken together with *'apo,* exactly as the masoretic accentuation and many modern scholars have done, there was no alternative but to render *ḥemah 'apo* as the equivalent of *ḥamath 'apo* ; this is what Saadia did *min ḥamiyyat-i ghadabihi* and JPS (" the fury of his anger "), and J. Ziegler (*Isaias* in the new Catholic Echter-Bibel series, 1948, " die Glut seines Zornes ")—all three translations being conservative and in the spirit of G, T, P, and V!—and countless others. The versions could just as well have read *ḥemah 'apo* and rendered as though *ḥamath 'apo* ; consequently, they are a very dubious source and authority for the reading *ḥamath.*

Finally, the canons of lower textual criticism weigh heavily in favour of MT *ḥemah 'apo* and against DSI. The reasoning has to be clearly as follows : whereas *ḥamath 'apo* is a ready and obvious " correction " or misreading of *ḥemah 'apo,*[2] it is far less likely that anyone misread *ḥamath 'apo* as *ḥemah 'apo* in context. The principle *lex difficilior praestat,* in the light of and in conjunction with the other arguments above, is thoroughly pertinent here.

In fine, there is ample reason to reject DSI's reading as only another of the many instances of " improvement " of DSI[3] and to retain MT *ḥemah 'apo,* however one may construe it in context, as original.[4]

New York City.   HARRY M. ORLINSKY.

---

[1] A goodly number of scholars have argued in this vein. Thus KNOBEL, *Der Prophet Jesaia,* 1872, ad loc., construes " *ḥemah 'apo* als *eine Gluth Zorn von ihm,* also als Appos. für *ḥamath 'apo* zu nehmen . . . Vgl. Ew. § 287. h." See also § 287k in EWALD'S *Syntax* ; and cf. BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS (s. *ḥemah,* 404b), " *'apo* as appos." ; following, *e.g.,* GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH-COWLEY, *Heb. Gramm.*28, § 131k, p. 425 : " Permutation is to be regarded as a variety of apposition . . . Is. 42²⁵ *he poured upon him fury,* namely, *his anger* " ; and KÖNIG, *Syntax,* § § 285f, 332k.

[2] Some Hebrew manuscripts of Isaiah are interesting here. Kenn 150 is lacking *ḥemah* ; Kenn 4, 95, 196 are lacking *'apo* ; Kenn 384 reads *ḥaron* for *ḥemah* ; and Ken 1 reads *ḥamath.* One has but to keep in mind the history of *ḥemah 'apo* in the primary versions, and the fact that *ḥamath 'apo* does not conform to Biblical usage, to realise that none of these manuscripts has retained the original reading here. Kenn 1 (*ḥamath 'apo,* if correctly read), which shares with all the Hebrew manuscripts collated by KENNICOTT, DE ROSSI, GINSBURG, KAHLE, etc., the notable feature that they show no affinity whatever with DSI in its variations from MT, may be due either to a misreading of *ḥemah* (*he* and *taw* in the Hebrew square script can be readily confused) or to a (doubtlessly unconscious) " correction " in the manner of Kenn 384 *ḥaron.*

[3] Cf. BURROWS, *BASOR,* 113, Feb., 1949, 26 ff. ; *JBL,* 68 (1949), 209-211 ; ORLINSKY, " *Studies I,*" p. 159, n. 11 ; REIDER, *JQR,* 41, July, 1950, 62-4, 67.

[4] DSI *w'wzz* for MT *we'ezuz* has of course nothing whatever to justify it ; it is but a typically sloppy error of DSI.

EZEKIEL XXIV, 10

הרבה העצים הדלק האש התם הבשר והרקח המרקחה והעצמות יחרו

For this the Revised Version has:

> Heap on the wood, make the fire hot, boil well the flesh, and make thick the broth, and let the bones be burned.

The phrase translated "make thick the broth" is rendered "spice the spicing" in the sense of "spice (the meat) well" in B.D.B., *Hebr. Lex.*, page 955a, which regards the words as very dubious and gives a proposal of Kraetzschmar who reads הרק המרק "empty out the broth." This suggestion is favoured by Bewer in Kittel, *Bib. Hebr.*[3] He accepts the emendation as the probable reading and cites in its support the LXX and Old Latin (ed. Dold).

The purpose of this note is to suggest that an additional, small change greatly improves the sense of the following words. "Let the bones be burned" might be defended as a reference to the bones used as fuel in verse 5, but there it is generally agreed that by a slight textual change "wood" should be read. Here the bones in the pot are meant, but the meaning of the words as they stand is not clear. A. B. Davidson in the *Cambridge Bible, ad loc.*, says that the word "burned" is used "inexactly of the powerful action of the heat in boiling, or, less naturally, the contents of the pot are supposed to suffer directly from the fire." If, however, יחדו is read in place of יחרו this difficulty disappears and the verse is seen to fit into the context better. For after the wood is piled on and the fire kindled, the command is to "finish the meat," either in the sense of boiling it well or, better, of making an end of it. Then, in reference to the denudation of Jerusalem of its inhabitants after the ordeal of the siege, the verse continues:

> Empty out the broth and the bones together.

After this, verse 11, which begins "Then set it empty on the coals," follows naturally.

WILLIAM DUFF McHARDY.

University of London.

HOSEA XII, 1 :

ויהודה עד רד עם אל ועם קדושים נאמן

The interpretation of this passage is difficult, since according to its apparent meaning it exempts Judah from the guilt, while at the same time (v. 3) Judah is included in the guilt. Various emendations to this verse have been proposed, none of them quite satisfactory. However, as is frequently the case with such difficulties, perhaps the massoretic text can be helpful by establishing the correct meaning of the particular words. Ehrlich (Randglassen, ad loc.) compares the verb *rad* with Jer. ii, 31, *radnu,* which he connects in turn with the Arabic root *rād,* meaning : " to search for a resting place." However, Ehrlich's rendering of the verse is too artificial.

Now *rad* can also be connected with the Assyrian verb *redu,* which means " to walk after, to follow " (Delitzsch, Assyrisches Wörterbuch, *s.v.*). By a slight emendation, reading the plural *'elim,* the meaning becomes clear : Judah is continually[1] following the *'elim.*[2] Because *qedoshim* was understood as a plural *majestatis* and a reference to the god of Israel (cf. Is, xxix, 19), the plural ending in *'elim* was omitted, thus creating the false impression that Judah is being praised in this verse for his fidelity. However, *qedoshim* is here used as a plural form, and has the same meaning as *'elim.*

The term *qedoshim* for " the gods " is found in Phœnician in the inscription of Eshmunazar (Corp. Inscript. Semit. iii, 1). It is also found in Ugaritic, where the Gods are called *bny qdshym.*[3] In later times *qedoshim* was understood to refer to angels (Psalms lxxxix, 6, 8 ; Job. xv, 15). Originally, however, it designated gods as well as demons and ghosts.[4] This is the meaning in the present

---

[1] For *'od* in the sense of " continuous " cf. Gen. xlvi, 29 ; Ruth i, 14.

[2] For " following " in the sense of " adhering to," " worshipping " cf. Dt. vi, 14 and elsewhere.

[3] GORDON, Ugaritic Handbook 266a. This term in the Ugaritic texts corresponds to *bene 'elohim* in Gen. vi, 2. Again *da'ath qedoshim* in Prov. ix, 10 ; xxx, 3, correspond to *da'ath 'elohim* in Prov. ii, 5 ; Hosea iv, 1. Professor H. L. GINSBERG informs me that the singular *qdsh* for " a god " is also found in Ugaritic. According to some commentators (for example, GUNKEL) *liqdoshim* in Psalms xvi, 3, refers to pagan gods. However, in our view, the traditional Jewish interpretation (*Midr. Psalms* ; RASHI ad loc.), according to which the reference is to the ancestors buried in the land, is preferable. There are various clues in Biblical and post-Biblical literature pointing to the cult of ancestors and their graves.

[4] Similarly, *'elohim* is originally an indefinite collective designation for all kinds of demons and gods (cf. ROBERTSON SMITH-COOK, *Religion of the Semites* 445, 46. HÖLSCHER, *Geschichte der Israelitischen u. Jüdischen Religion,* 70, 71). This original meaning is still preserved in Exod. xxii, 19, where the usual designation *'aherim* is omitted in the massoretic text. The reference here may be to the worship of demons, as in Lev. xvii, 7.

verse where Hosea refers to the worship of the various gods and demons in Judah, as attested also by the historical records (II Ki. xxiii, 6f ; xxiv).

For a more complete understanding of this verse we must note that the reason for this satirical reference to the tribal ancestor (Judah) is because the shrines and the cults were associated with his name. To these cults, which, supposedly, derived from the ancestor, the prophet opposes the true monotheism, as represented for him by the religion of Moses.[1] Therefore, he ironically refers to Jacob's meeting and wrestling with *'elohim* (v. 4), whose designation as *mal'akh* may be a later substitute,[2] and who in the prophet's view signifies the objects (*ba'alim*), which the nation was still worshipping. The meaning of the verse is then that since ancestral times the nation has continually adhered to the *'elim* and *qedoshim*. By this interpretation we gain a complete parallelism : Ephraim is insincere and Judah actually adheres to the old cults. Both sections of the nation are thus equally guilty of deviation from the true (monotheistic) religion, because of their attachment to the old cults.

CH. W. REINES.

New York.

---

1 See my article in the Hebrew Periodical *Sinai*, Vol. xi, 7-8, p. 43.
2 Originally this term may have designated a demon, and it is quite probable that Hosea understands it in this sense (cf. note 4).

THE EPITAPH ON JONAH DURAN:
A REJOINDER

Dr. Roth, in volume I, number 4 of the *Journal of Jewish Studies*, supplies an important omission on our part in the joint edition of the Epitaph of Joseph Duran, which appeared in the previous issue of this *Journal*. He draws attention to the fact that the Jews were expelled from the Provence (excepting for the Papal possessions) at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Dr. Roth therefore concludes that Jonah Duran could not have exercised his function as a Dayyan in Toulon. This still leaves the central core of the problem unsolved. We refer to the undoubted existence of Jews in the Provence in the seventeenth century, which Jewish historians attest. From the fact that Toulon was an important *entrepôt* for trade, it is reasonable to assume that the authorities would turn a blind eye to this illegal infiltration. The discovery of a tombstone recording the death of Dayyan Jonah Duran in the outskirts of Toulon points to the existence of an organised Jewish community in that port itself, which no amount of hypotheses can explain away.

The other points raised in the note may be briefly answered: (1) The assumption of an error in the date can be ruled out, as we shall show later. (2) Had Duran died as a prisoner, a galley slave, or an exile, so significant a biographical detail could scarcely have been omitted from the epitaph. (3) A new rendering is suggested for *bhylw* which Roth renders " by his service " instead of " by his anguish," as we have done. It would be interesting to know on what authority *hyl* is rendered by " service."[1] Is the writer by chance confusing *hyl* with *sabha,* which means both " army," and " service in the army "? But even if this new meaning for *hyl* could be accepted, it must be rejected on the score of metre, which requires a word ending in —*ilo* rather than —*elo*. (4) The suggestion that the exact date is conveyed by *bNysn* may well be correct. But two arguments may be adduced against it. The *beth* would probably have had a sign over it to indicate that it must be taken as a numeral (just as *hash-Shekhinah* has it over the second *he*), and there would probably have been a space left between the *beth* and the rest of the word. (5) Lastly, we are told that there is no reason why the final *he* of *hash-Shekhinah* should not have been included in the computation of the date, but there is every reason why the chronogram cannot be equated with 1630. If we examine the photograph, we shall find the sign ~ over the second *he*. This proves incontrovertibly that the *he* stands for 5000, and the date therefore corresponds to 1625 A.C.E.

We avail ourselves of this opportunity to correct a few errors which have unfortunately crept into the text of our article.

Page 195, lines 11-12 of the epitaph. The sign ~ should be over *hash-Shekhinah* and not over *me'onah,* and footnote 8 should begin with " The second *he, etc.*" *For* 5375 *read* 5385.

R.B., J.L., C.M.

---

[1] [Compare I Chron. ix, 13, xxvi, 8.—J.L.T.]

SURVEY OF CURRENT LITERATURE

H. L. GINSBERG. Studies in *Koheleth* (*Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Vol. xvii*). New York, 1950. Pp. 46.

In the first of his four short studies, Dr. Ginsberg discusses what he calls Koheleth's programme. This is contained in chs. i. 2-ii. 26, which, unlike many commentators, he regards as a single unit, and which, in his view, forms an introduction to the rest of the book. The two main thoughts in the programme are, first, that wisdom and acquisitions ('*amal*, the author holds, means, not " toil," but " gain, profit ") are at best vanity, and at worst a grievous ill ; and secondly, that the only good which man can get out of life is the enjoyment of what he acquires—and this enjoyment is only granted to him if he is pleasing to God. The remaining chapters of the book are thought to consist largely of further demonstrations of these two main themes.

In the second study, Dr. Ginsberg turns his attention to the designation *melekh* as applied to the author of Koheleth. He believes that in i. 12 '*al-Yisra'el* is not original (cp, i. 1), and that *melekh* here means, not " king," but " a man of means, a property-holder " (*molekh* is to be read here, and in ii. 12). In i. 1, however, *melekh* was probably intended to claim for the author the social rank or the antiquity of Solomon.

The third study is devoted to a defence, by means of an examination of numerous passages, of the hypothesis that the Hebrew text of Koheleth is a translation from an Aramaic original. Special atten-

tion is here given to the work of F. Zimmermann, who, in Dr. Ginsberg's view, has made a strong—in some respects a decisive—case for an Aramaic original, though not all his arguments appear to him to be cogent. To this part of the work we shall return below.

In the last study, Dr. Ginsberg discusses the dates of the composition of Koheleth and of the translation of it from Aramaic into Hebrew. The former he would place in the third century B.C., the latter in the Maccabæan age.

This volume contains, as will be seen, much that is of interest. It contains, too, as is to be expected in any work by Dr. Ginsberg, a good deal that is original. The third study—on the original language in which Koheleth was written—is both the longest and the most important. We accordingly offer a few comments upon it. It may be readily admitted that some of Dr. Ginsberg's examples of mistranslations from an Aramaic original are attractive. We may cite as an example his argument—following Zimmermann —that *besel*, which occurs twice in vii. 12, results from a misunderstanding of an original Aramaic verb *btl* " has ceased " (p. 22f). Other examples, however, are less convincing. Thus, in viii. 8, Dr. Ginsberg thinks that *bammilhamah* is a mistranslation of an original *bqbr'* " in the grave," which the Hebrew translator misread as, or which became corrupted into, *bqrb'* " in war " (p. 29f). But surely the difficult word here is not *milhamah* but *mishlahath*. This word is taken by Dr. Ginsberg, as by many other scholars, to mean " release," but there can be little doubt that Zim-

mermann is right when he explains it by reference to the Aramaic *shlh*, which is used of "laying aside" (armour ; see *J.Q.R.*, xxxvi, 1945-46, p. 42). There is, therefore, no necessity for Dr. Ginsberg's supposition of an original *bqbr*. Again, in x. 20, Dr. Ginsberg suggests that, in place of *bemadda'akha*, the Aramaic original had *bmrb'k* "in thy lying-place" (p. 33). Once more, however, his supposition is unnecessary, for the Hebrew *madda'* here means "rest, repose"—an adequate enough parallel to *hadhre mish-kabhekha* (see the present writer in *J.T.S.*, 50, 1949, p. 177). Further, is it quite certain that the expression *tobh lifne* in ii. 26 is necessarily an Aramaism, as Dr. Ginsberg says it is (p. 10) ? The Septuagint at I Sam. xxxix. 10 (*agathos su enopion mou*) at least suggests that the expression may have been known also in Hebrew (see S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, p. 221).

It is then possible that some at least of the linguistic phenomena which Dr. Ginsberg would explain by the hypothesis of an Aramaic original are patient of explanation along other lines. The fact that this is so can but underline the necessity for a rigorously thorough examination of each individual passage under discussion. Though we may entertain doubts about the correctness of some of Dr. Ginsberg's views, we are not prevented thereby from recognising that in these studies he makes a notable contribution to the literature on Koheleth. It is a pity that the author's English style makes his work difficult to read. His vocabulary includes many words which will be unfamiliar to most readers in this country—*e.g.*, "prosopography," "boners," "isopsephism."

D. WINTON THOMAS.
Cambridge.